PRESENTED
BY
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BOOK SOCIETY
11. ADAM STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

Ernest L. Fardell
Jan - 1833

Library of The Theological Seminary
PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

BX 5149 .C5 D55
Dimock, N. 1825-1909.
Papers on the doctrine of
the English Church

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/papersondoctrine00dimo

Ernest Fardell
Jan. 1888

PAPERS

ON THE

Doctrine of the English Church,

CONCERNING

THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

BY

AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.

LONDON:
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BOOK SOCIETY,
11, ADAM STREET, STRAND.

CONTENTS.

I.

Page

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS: ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY . 5

II.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS: REFORMERS OF THE REIGNS OF HENRY VIII. AND EDWARD VI. 41

III.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS: REFORMING DIVINES OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH 103

IV.

BOOKS OF SANCTION 169

V.

THE HOMILIES 223

VI.

THE CATECHISM 289

VII.

Page
THE ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER 431

VIII.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES 597

IX.

INDEX—1. OF SUBJECTS. 2. OF AUTHORS QUOTED . . i

INTRODUCTION.

Controversy, in these days, is a necessity. To enter upon it from a love of controversy is not.

There is something very sad and humbling in the thought, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—the Communion of His Body and Blood—the Feast of His dying love, should ever be, among those who are called His disciples, an occasion of envying, strifes, debates.

And yet for what they were persuaded to be the truth in this matter, our Reformers, we know, earnestly contended and resisted unto blood.

If, indeed, they had God's truth on their side, a necessity was laid upon them. And if so, not on them alone, but on us also, is necessity laid, to contend for that truth which they taught and left as an heritage to us.

And, at this time, it seems that there is an especial need to clear both the teaching of our Reformers and of the Formularies of our Church from misconceptions, which are occasioning anxiety, and perplexity, and much danger to the minds of many.

It is with this object that these Papers are sent forth.

The writer professes to start with a very strong conviction, that what is called "The Doctrine of the Real Objective Presence," was *not* the teaching of our Reformers, and is *not* the doctrine of our Church.

Not only so; he believes the grounds on which his convictions rest are so clear and firm, that he cannot but desire to ask those whose views may have been tending in an opposite direction to pause and reconsider this subject. Nay, more: he feels con-

strained even to beg of those, (and he hopes he may do so without offence,) who have already given in their verdict against his judgment, to go with him over the ground afresh, and carefully observe the position and bearings of the landmarks which our Reformers have set up, and left for us to maintain and defend.

At the same time, he enters on this work not without a feeling in unison with the fears of those, who viewing especially the dangers on the other side, are very anxious to shun the error which would reduce the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to mere signs. And he desires to disclaim sympathy with any views which would despoil these "holy mysteries" of any portion of their great "dignity," robbing "the bread which we break" of its effectual power, through the Communion of the Body of Christ, inwardly to strengthen man's heart, and emptying "the cup of blessing" of its exceeding blessedness, as the Communion of the Blood of Christ, to the souls of His faithful people.

And towards those whom he is, of necessity, opposing in this view of our Church's teaching, he desires, not only very earnestly to disclaim any personal feeling, but also very carefully to avoid any language which may be calculated to provoke bitterness, or wrath, or anger; being assured that the cause of truth needs not the support of human passions, and being anxious to avoid all such weapons as are not weapons of Christian warfare, desiring indeed, if by God's mercy it may be so, so to write as to attract rather than to repel.

Further, he would desire not only himself to pray, but most earnestly to beg the prayers of others, that the God of all mercy may pardon all errors and imperfections in this work; that the God of all peace may take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatever else may hinder from godly union and concord; and that the Lord of all power and might may bless what there is here of His truth, to the profit of souls, and to the glory of His holy Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

PAPERS ON THE

EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

No. I.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS:

ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

The particular point of Eucharistic doctrine with which these Papers have immediately to do, is that which of late years has been so prominently set forth under the name of "The Real Objective Presence." At the time of the Reformation the phrase "Real Presence" was commonly regarded as indicating a doctrine *not* held by our Reformers. But while in the sense which it commonly bore they rejected it, there was another sense (as descriptive of the true efficacious Presence, not in the elements, but in the ministration) in which they were not afraid to accept and use it. And subsequently it commended itself to the judgment of some of our eminent divines, whose views were not repugnant to the principles of the Reformation.

And it is quite possible that, in the same way, the expression "Real Objective Presence" may commend itself to the minds of some, who, while willing to adopt a novel phraseology, are far from intending to adopt any novelty in doctrine.

Objection, indeed, may be taken to the form of expression. But it is not the expression, but the doctrine; not the name, but the thing, with which we are concerned. This doctrine has been taught and is being taught, not as any

matter of opinion, but as "*de fide*." It has been taught, and it is being taught, as the doctrine of the English Church.

And the enquiry is one which English churchmen are beginning to feel to be of momentous importance, and one too, to which they should seek an answer,—whether this doctrine was, indeed, held by our Reformers; and whether it is contained in the teaching of our Formularies.

In this enquiry they are asking for guidance and help; and such guidance and help it is the primary aim of these Papers to afford.

It will be convenient, for reasons which will appear as we proceed, to bring under review: *first*, the teaching of our Reformers; *next*, that of books of lower authority in the English Church; *then*, that of (1) our Catechism and Liturgy, (2) our Articles.

In the first place we must endeavour to gain as clear a view as we can of what is meant by "The Real Objective Presence," and what *is* that doctrine, which under this name is taught by its maintainers. We must ask of them an answer to the question—

WHAT IS MEANT BY THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE?

I. We are told "that in the Holy Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ are present, yet not after the manner of a body, but spiritually, sacramentally, divinely, mystically, ineffably, supra-locally, through the operation of the Word of Christ, and of God the Holy Ghost."*

* See Pusey, "The Real Presence, the doctrine of the English Church" p. 204. "So in regard to the Holy Eucharist, I believe Him to be locally present only in Heaven, when He is localised by His Ascension in the flesh; but supra-locally (as has been said by most thoughtful theologians) He is present both in His Godhead and in His Manhood." (Machonochie's Address, Jan. 1867, p. 5.)

II. But with this we are told,* that the Body and Blood of Christ are REALLY, TRULY, and SUBSTANTIALLY so present, after consecration, *in, or under the form of bread and wine, that* (unless† by special Divine interference this Presence be withdrawn) *where the elements are, there, of necessity‡ are the body and blood of Christ, and this quite independent and irrespective of use and participation,*‖ so that—

* See "Tracts for the Day," No. v., p. 18, and p. 30. "Under those external Forms there is the *true, real,* and *substantial* Presence of Christ's Body and Blood."

† Which Dr. Pusey seems to think an admissible opinion in the case of the consecrated element being devoured by an animal, or by wicked men. (See Pusey, "Real Presence, from the Fathers," p. 37.) Elsewhere Dr. Pusey says, "Certainly, it does follow from the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence that, *unless Almighty God interfere,* the wicked would receive sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ, although they cannot receive Christ in their souls, or be 'partakers of Christ.' But this was the very point on which I did not venture to decide." (Pusey, "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 257.) Now Dr. Pusey believes as *certain truth,* that the wicked *do* receive Christ's body and blood. (Ibid, p. 307.) Archdeacon Denison says, "We do not know that the Presence thus vouchsafed is, under any circumstances, *withdrawn.*" See "Goode on Eucharist," i., p. 13; see also p. 49. Pope Innocent is quoted as teaching that in case of a mouse eating the host "miraculously doth the substance of bread return again; not that bread which was turned into flesh; but it cometh to pass, that instead of it, other bread is miraculously created, which bread is eaten." (Bullinger's Decades, v. 306.) But another Pope (Gregory xi., an. 1371) prohibited this teaching under pain of excommunication. (See Stillingfleet in Gibson's Preservative, ix., p. 232; also Garbett's "Voices of the Church of England," p. 73; Ridley's Works, p. 199.)

‡ "Ex necessitate rei." (Denison as quoted in Goode on Eucharist i., 13.)

‖ "It does not depend, in any manner on our faith. By consecration Christ is present, whether we believe it or whether we believe it not. His presence is not dependent upon our use of the Sacrament. He is present before its use, in its use, and after its use." ("Tracts for the Day," No. v., p. 26.)

(1.) When the bread is taken into the hand, from the hand of the priest, there in the bodily hand is the Body of Christ; and when the mouth receives the bread and wine, there in the bodily mouth, under the form of bread and wine, is the Body and Blood of Christ.*

(2.) Wicked men and unbelievers, receiving the bread and wine, receive, equally with believers, the very Body and Blood of Christ.†

(3.) When the elements are on the Holy Table, there is

"This Presence I believe to be conferred by the Word of Christ as spoken by the priest, through the operation of God the Holy Ghost, irrespective of faith or any personal qualifications either in the consecrator or receiver." (Machonochie's Address, Jan., 1867, p. 6.)

* (See Archdeacon Denison as quoted in Goode on Eucharist, i. 16,) also Dr. Pusey, "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," Preface xxv. etc. "The same sacrament, the whole sacrament, robbed of no part of itself, is in the mouth of all, *good and bad*." (Denison's Saravia, p. 105. See also pp. 208—31, 33, etc.) "I believe.....that the Body and Blood of Christ are objectively given by the priest, objectively taken by every communicant." (Machonochie's Address, Jan. 1867, p. 5. See also "Tracts for the Day," No. v., p. 26, 27; and Forbes on Articles, ii., p. 589.)

* "All, worthy and unworthy, receive the *Sacramentum*, the outward part; they all alike receive the *Res Sacramenti*, the inward part: but only the worthy receive the *Virtus* Sacramenti." ("Tracts for the Day," iii., 79.") "The consequence of either kind of unworthiness is not that we receive the sign without the thing signified, the Sacrament without the substance, but that we receive both, in the one case to condemnation, and in the other without the benefits." (Ibid, v. 24.) "The Church also teaches that this Presence depends on God's will, not on man's belief; and therefore that bad and good people receive the very same thing in communicating; the good for their benefit, the bad for their condemnation." (Rev. A. T. Littledale, LL.D. "The Real Presence.")

Christ under the form of bread and wine, and Christ being there, is there to be adored,* under those forms of bread and wine.

(4.) By virtue of this Presence, the Holy Eucharist is the sacrifice of the New Covenant,† quite distinct from any figurative or only commemorative offering, or any offering of (1) prayer and praise, or (2) of ourselves, our souls and bodies, or (3) of our alms and oblations; inasmuch as that same body, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same blood, once for all shed for us, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the priest.‡

* "The question then, as to the adoration of our Lord present in the Holy Eucharist, should be considered, apart from any notion of seeming unfitness.....The simple question is, 'Is our Lord and God present there?' If, or rather since, He is present there, the outward appearance is no more hindrance to us, than the dress which He wore as Man." (Pusey, "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 329, 330. See also Denison in Goode on Eucharist, p. 15.) "The Christian Church teaches and has always taught that in the Holy Communion, after consecration, the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are verily and indeed present on the altar, under the forms of bread and wine." (Rev. A. T. Littledale, LL.D. "The Real Presence.")

† See Rev. A. D. Wagner's evidence before Ritual Commission, p. 113. "Thoughts on Low Masses," p. 31, and Stuart's "Mediation of the Church," p. 46.

‡ See "Profession of Faith" signed by twenty-three clergymen in first report of Royal Commission on Ritual. "The Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice depends upon the Doctrine of the Real Objective Presence." (Pusey's Eirenicon, p. 25.)

"Without that doctrine as containing and inferring the Sacerdotal office of the priest, and the sacrificial character of the altar, there would seem to me to be no Church at all." (Bennett's "Plea for Toleration," p. 2.) "I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice." (Rev. W. J. Bennett before Ritual Commission, p. 72.)

"It is no bare sign of an absent victim that we offer before God

The doctrine of this sacrifice is regarded by some as easily reconcileable with the Sacrifice of the Mass.*

It is important to add that by some of the teachers of this doctrine very *special* stress is laid on the Body and Blood of Christ being "given in and by the consecrated bread and wine to *all*," (whether worthy or unworthy) and "received by *all* who come to the Lord's Table." And the importance of this, we are told, is, that "it supplies an unfailing test of what is meant by any one who affirms of himself that he holds the doctrine of the Real Presence."†

It is to be carefully observed also that this Presence is to be regarded, according to its teachers, as something quite distinct and different from any Presence of the virtue,

in the Holy Eucharist.....but by the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament veiled beneath the form of bread and wine, we offer before God, Christ Himself." (Stuart's Mediation of the Church, 46.)

"The Eucharistic Sacrifice, is Christ Himself, supernaturally present in the Sacrament, the victim slain once for all upon the Cross." ("Thoughts on Low Masses," p. 35.) "If Christ were not substantially present in the Sacrament, then He could not be thus offered, and there would be no *real* sacrifice in the Eucharist whatever." (Ibid, p. 44.) "The presence of the one Spotless Victim upon our altars must plead for us here, must be an effectual propitiation, the presentation of a true and proper sacrifice." (Tract, "Thou art a Priest for ever," p. 17.) "That offering the Church makes on her thousand altars, the Spotless Lamb of God, present under the outward forms of bread and wine." (Ibid, p. 15.)

* See Pusey's Eirenicon, p. 28.

† See Denison as quoted in Goode on Eucharist, i., p. 18. "A High Churchman believes that when the priest utters the words of institution 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood,' the Holy Ghost comes down upon the elements of Bread and Wine, and they become the Very Real Body and Blood of Christ. This, they believe, is received by good and bad communicants alike." (Husband's Catholic Tracts, i., p. 5.)

efficacy, and saving power of Christ's Body and Blood. It is nothing less than the Body and Blood of Christ themselves, which (according to "the Real Objective Presence") are "PRESENT THINGS" "under the form of Bread and Wine."*

Such being the doctrine taught under the name of "the Real Objective Presence,"† we proceed first—

TO COMPARE THIS DOCTRINE WITH THE TEACHING OF OUR REFORMERS.

We turn to the writings of our Reformers to enquire,

I. Did they teach this doctrine?

* See Denison as quoted in Goode on Eucharist, i. 14. "He is present *substantially*, not by any grace or virtue emanating from His Sacred Body, or infused into the Bread and Wine; but in the very substance of His true Body and Blood. It is not a presence of 'power or virtue,' but of PERSON. The Bread and Wine are not called His Body and Blood because they are virtually, or to all intents and purposes, such to us who receive them. Neither are they figures and symbols of a person absent, having no influence upon us except to teach or to awaken thought. Under these external forms there is the *true*, *real*, and *substantial* presence of CHRIST'S Body and Blood, animated by the living soul, and both pervaded by the Living Deity—whole CHRIST, GOD, and MAN."—("Tracts for the Day," v. 30.)

† I trust in the above statement there is nothing which may tend to misrepresent or distort the views of the Ritualists. It is not meant that all who stand on the side of the Real Objective Presence would accept *the whole* of the doctrine as here set down. It may be hoped that many would subscribe to but a small part of it. And many more there may be, who have something of a favourable leaning towards the doctrine, from a misapprehension, that any other view leaves faith without an Object,—to create, by emotion or imagination, a Presence which is not real, and to receive that which is neither offered nor given. There is reason to think that such a misconception is very prevalent. Something like it seems to underlie a considerable portion of "The Kiss of Peace," and to pervade many of the writings on the same side.

Or, II. Did they regard it as an open question?

Or, III. Did they not reject and repudiate it?

At the threshold of this enquiry it may be well to observe that the phrase "Real Presence" was in common use at the time of the Reformation, to signify one chief part* of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, that part which the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist (commonly known as Consubstantiation†) did not reject, and which, it seems to be generally‡

* See Goode on Eucharist, i. 3. Garbett's Lectures, "Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," p. 13, sq.

† Not that the name "Consubstantiation" was accepted by the Lutherans themselves. It might, no doubt, be understood as implying a teaching which they never taught.

‡ Not however by Archdeacon Denison. See his words in Goode on Eucharist, i. 19. Dr. Pusey seems to accept Luther's doctrine on the Eucharist, so far at least as the Real Presence is concerned; but objecting, "The weak point in the Lutheran system is, that the only office assigned to the Sacrament is to kindle faith." ("Doctrine of the Real Presence from the Fathers," 37.) So again, "The strength of the strict Lutheranism was its adherence to the meaning of our Lord's words, as the Church has ever received them, its weakness was to make our Lord's gift of His own Body and Blood, a *mere* testimony to faith." ("Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," 109.) Transubstantiation only seems to add to this the absence of the substance of Bread and Wine. See "Sarpi's Council of Trent," p. 309; and Dr. Pusey, "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," pp. 151—157. Dr. Pusey says, "My own conviction is, that our Articles deny Transubstantiation in one sense, and that the Roman Church according to the explanation of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, affirms it in another. . . . A very eminent foreign Divine, of the Roman Communion, allows (I am informed) that 'the *materia* of bread and wine remains,' and that, following Theodoret, Pope Gelasius, and other Fathers, we may say that 'there are two natures in the Sacrament.' But, if so, the whole controversy between us is at an end." ("Eirenicon," 229, 230.) The Romish opponents of the Reformers claimed the Lutherans as hold-

now understood and admitted, is at one with the doctrine known as "the Real Objective Presence."

And when this doctrine is sometimes spoken of by Romish writers as the "Corporal Presence," or the "Carnal Presence," we are not to suppose that by this they meant "Presence *after a bodily manner*" (any more than those who now teach "the Real Objective Presence") but "Presence *of a Body*," though it be of a Body present after the manner of a spirit.*

In conducting our enquiry as to the opinion of our Reformers† on this question, we will first take in order the Archbishops of Canterbury, beginning with the reign of Edward VI., and ending with the reign of Elizabeth.

ing with them on the doctrine of the Real Presence. And Lutheran statements of doctrine have been accepted by Romish theologians so far as regards the Real Presence. Mr. Cobb (Sequel, p. 179, 180) says of the quotation of Gardiner from the Lutheran Œpinus ("Cranmer on Lord's Supper," P. S. Edit., p. 20) "Now here is an explanation of the Holy Eucharist, which is not only true, but which if addressed to the mind of a person conversant with scholastic definition and the real teaching of Rome, would instantly commend itself as a just and exact statement of Roman belief on the subject."

* See Goode on Eucharist. i. 15, 19. Bellarmine says that "Christ's Body is there truly, substantially, really, but not corporally, nay you may say spiritually." "But 'spiritually' with him means, after the manner of spirits." See Jeremy Taylor's "Real Presence," pp. 16, 17. So Gardiner, "Speaking in the Catholic teaching of the manner of Christ's presence, they call it a spiritual manner of presence," in Cranmer, P. S. Edit., i. 112. See also pp. 89, 91, 111, 155, 175, 189, and Cousin's "History of Transubstantiation," chap. iii. 1; and Dr. Pusey, "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 211.

† This word is here used to include not only those to whom the term might be more strictly applied, but also divines of the Reformed Church up to the death of Queen Elizabeth.

We shall thus have before us four names: 1. Cranmer. 2. Parker. 3. Grindall. 4. Whitgift.

1. Cranmer.

Cranmer was born in 1489, educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, married a niece of Osiander, 1531, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury 1533. His influence was predominant in the Reformation of Edward VI. He was imprisoned on the accession of Mary in 1553, then taken to Oxford, and after disputation condemned and excommunicated as a heretic. His courage failed him, and he was prevailed upon to sign a recantation. But, at last, he died in the faith of the Reformation, most solemnly recanting his recantation, and declaring, "I believe concerning the Sacrament as I taught in my book against the late Bishop of Winchester." He was burnt on the 21st March 1855, his left hand pointing upwards, his right hand (which had signed the recantation) thrust into the flames with the cry, "Oh! this unworthy hand!" "With upturned eye the poor penitent exclaimed, 'Lord Jesus receive my spirit.' The body was motionless; not once did it swerve from its position; it seemed to be as insensible of pain as the stake to which it was bound." (Hook's Lives. Series 2, vol. ii., p. 417.)

No doubt there are in the writings of Cranmer (as of others among our Reformers) expressions used sometimes, such as, isolated from the context, and viewed apart from explanatory statements, might seem to be not inconsistent with the doctrine before us. All such passages are cleared from misunderstanding, and have their true sense stamped upon them, by the following very clear and distinct statement in his Preface to "The Answer to Gardiner." (Edition of 1551.)

I.

"When I say and repeat many times in my book, that the Body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive

the Sacrament; lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean, that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet He is corporally in the persons that duly receive them, this is to advertise the reader, that I mean no such thing; but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's Body that was crucified for us, and of His Blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the Sacraments." (Parker Society Edition, 3.)

A few more extracts from Cranmer's writings shall be set down here.

II.

"They (the Papists) say that Christ is corporally under or in the form of bread and wine. We say that Christ is NOT THERE, neither *corporally* nor *spiritually;* but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine, He is spiritually, and corporally in heaven." (P.S. Edit. i. p. 54.)

III.

"This spiritual meat of Christ's Body and Blood is *not received in the mouth* and digested in the stomach (as corporal meats and drinks commonly be,) but it is received with a pure heart and a sincere *faith.* And the *true eating and drinking* of the said Body and Blood of Christ is, with a constant and lively *faith to believe,* that Christ gave His body, and shed His blood upon the Cross for us, and that

He doth so join and incorporate Himself to us, that He is our head and we His members, and flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bones, having Him dwelling in us, and we in Him." (Ibid, 43.)

IV.

"I mean not that Christ is *spiritually* either *in the table*, or *in the bread and wine* that be upon the table; but I mean that He is present in the ministration and receiving of that holy Supper, according to His own institution and ordinance." (Ibid, 148.)

V.

"I am *sure* that evil men DO NOT eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ." (Ibid, 426.)

VI.

"Christ spake absolutely of manna and of the Supper; so that, after that absolute speaking of the Supper, wicked men *can* IN NO WISE *eat of the flesh of Christ and drink His blood.*"* (Ibid, 427.)

VII.

"This therefore shall be my issue: that as no Scripture, so no ancient author, known and approved, hath in plain terms your transubstantiation: nor that the Body and Blood of Christ be *really, corporally, naturally, and carnally under the forms of bread and wine;* NOR THAT EVIL MEN DO EAT THE VERY BODY AND DRINK THE VERY BLOOD OF CHRIST; nor *that Christ is offered every* day by the priest a sacrifice propitiatory for sin." (Ibid, 13.)

* The italics and capitals in these quotations *generally* are mine.

VIII.

In Cranmer's disputations at Oxford, we have Weston concluding an argument thus:—"*Ergo*, His true, natural, organical flesh is given to us to be eaten." Then follows—

Cranmer:—"I grant the consequence and the consequent."

Weston:—"Therefore we eat it with our mouth."

Cranmer:—"I DENY IT. We eat it through faith." (Ibid, 403.)

IX.

Again, *Weston*:—"When Christ said, 'Eat ye,' whether meant He, by the mouth or by faith?"

Cranmer:—"He meant that we should receive the body by faith, the bread by the mouth."

Weston:—"Nay, the body by the mouth."

Cranmer:—"THAT I DENY." (Ibid, 404).

X.

The following passage is given to show that Cranmer was contending against no gross, carnal, popular conception of the "Real Presence," as distinguished from the more recondite teaching of theologians.

"But why should I join with you here an issue in that matter which I never spake? For I never read, nor heard no man that said, saving you alone, that we do eat Christ grossly, or carnally, or as eating is taken in common speech without any figure; but all that ever I have heard or read say quite clean, contrary."* (Ibid, 112.)

* This passage is quoted by Dr. Blakeney in a paper in "The Protestant Churchman," (July, 1869, p. 319). Dr. Blakeney adds, "Cranmer is astonished that Gardiner would acknowledge a carnal

It would be easy to multiply quotations from Cranmer; but the above are perhaps more than sufficient to show clearly what Cranmer's views were. The place which

Presence even in a sense, and says that in doing so he stood alone. What a refutation is this of the assumption of Dr. Newman, of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Perry, and others, that it was only against a gross and carnal Presence the Reformers contended!" It is, indeed, obvious to every one reading the writings and disputations of the Reformers, that they had to deal with, not any gross popular statements of doctrines, but just the same subtilties as we have to meet now. But our Reformers held that the Corporal Presence, being the presence of a body, must, of necessity, be a gross and carnal Presence.

And herein Mr. Cobb, in the sequel to the "Kiss of Peace," (Preface vii., and Sec. ii. *passim*,) when he complains that Cranmer "never understood what was the Roman doctrine on this question," is himself, if I mistake not, altogether misunderstanding Crammer. Cranmer must have been very blind indeed, if he did not see where Gardiner would have led him. Cranmer *saw clearly enough*, but he altogether *refused to follow*. He denied that it was possible to follow without *absurdities*. I think Mr. Cobb will find that Cranmer did "*consciously reject*" what Mr. Cobb calls "the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence." (See Sequel, p. 211.) For not only did his mind *never grasp* the idea that there could be such a Presence real, yet not "corporal;" but his mind actually denied it. Nay, I believe Mr. Cobb will find that not Cranmer only, but our Reformers, and not our Reformers only, but subsequent Divines, maintained that the Presence of a Body, not as a Body, involves a contradiction. "Truth in what kind soever, is by no kind of truth gainsayed." (Hooker, Vol. ii., p. 360, Edit. Keble.) And, therefore, they held that the *truth* of Christ's Body, being corporally and locally present in heaven, forbids its being present, even though it be the Body of Christ, in another manner, that is to say, spiritually and *supralocally* on ten thousand altars at once. (See especially Cranmer on Lord's Supper, P. S. Edit., pp. 97, 98, 102, 140, 186.) And I must venture to submit that it was no peculiarity in the minds of Cranmer and our Reformers, that they *could not grasp* the idea of the Corporal Presence of a Body which has flesh and bones, being present *with flesh and bones;* yet present not corporally, but spiritually as to the mode, *i.e.*,

Cranmer occupies in the history of the English Reformation will justify our taking *so many*. To give more is the less needful now, because Dr. Pusey has acknowledged that

present after *the manner of a spirit*, which "*hath not flesh and bones.*"

The Corporal Presence of a Body corporally present with flesh and bones, THIS IS *a gross Carnal Presence*. And its grossness and carnality is *not* to be evaded or escaped by attempting to explain that the word "corporally" does not tell of the *manner* of the Presence, which is spiritual. If the explanation is *good*, the teaching which it explains is *gone*. If the teaching is *good*, the explanation is *worthless*. Is it wonderful that such evasions found "*no response*" in Cranmer's mind? (Page 187.)

Suppose I maintain the Presence of an angle as an *obtuse* angle; but finding an *obtuse* angle inadmissible, I attempt by explanation to make it appear that though a very obtuse angle, it is only very *acutely* present, or present after the manner of a very *acute* angle.

Will any one grasp my idea? Will not every one accuse me of absurdities? Shall I not be told that what is "acute" in the explanation of the *manner*, can never take away from what is "obtuse" in the statement concerning the angle?

And will the case be very different if I venture to say that in the matter before us, that which is "spiritual" in the explanation of the mode, can never take away from that which is "corporal" in the statement concerning the Presence? How difficult it is to reconcile the statement of the "corporal," and the explanation of the "spiritual" in the minds of the uneducated is evident, I suppose, from what we are told of "the gross popular view" which our Reformers had to combat." (See "Cranmer on Lord's Supper," p. 327.) How difficult also in the case of minds, some of which, at least, we should have expected to be better instructed, is evident from the words which Mr. Cobb quotes of King Henry the Fourth:

"The clergy," he said, "should engage in the search for the philospher's stone; for since they can change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, they must also, by the help of God, succeed in transmuting the baser metals into gold," (Sequel, p. 169);

Cranmer went "over to the Swiss school,"* and "unhappily fell" into the "Zwinglian heresy;" and the author of "The

and still more from the well-known recantation put into the mouth of Berengarius by Pope Nicolas, viz.:—

"That the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ sensually, not only in sacrament, but in truth, is handled by the priest's hands; and broken and grinded by the teeth of the faithful," words which though now renounced by the Church of Rome, were publicly read at Rome before one hundred and fourteen bishops, and sent by the Pope up and down the Churches of Italy, France, and Germany. (See "Jeremy Taylor," vol. vi., p. 203, &c.)

But the question is, Are the two really reconcileable in truth? No doubt it will be said, "Certainly they are, to faith which believes miracles.—(See "Tracts for the Day," v., pp. 31, 32.)

But to this let it be answered, "A miracle is one thing: a contradiction is another." And one not versed in the subtilties of the schools may, I trust, be forgiven in expressing a strong opinion, that, as it is a very unwise proceeding to aim at anything like training faith to believe all sorts of miracles without warrant of Scripture, or any other sufficient evidence; so it is a most dangerous thing to set faith to exercise itself in doing anything like putting out the eyes of common sense.

Hooker says of Christ's glorious Body: "A Body still it continueth, a Body consubstantial with our bodies, a Body of the same both nature and measure which it had on earth." (Eccles. Pol. v, 55.)

Jeremy Taylor writes: "God can new create the body, and change it into a spirit; but can a body, remaining a body, be at the same time a spirit? Or can it be a body, and yet not be in a place? Is it not determined so, that remaining in a place, it cannot be out of it? . . . . Now although God can change anything from being the thing it is to become another thing, yet is it not a contradiction to say it should be the same it is, and yet not the same? These are the essential, immediate consequents of supposing a body remaining a body, whose essence it is to be finite and determined in one place, can yet so remaining, be in a thousand places." (Real Presence, sect. xi., p. 14; vol. vi., p. 107.)

* See "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church." pp. 11 and 159.

Kiss of Peace" has been constrained in his new edition altogether to give him up.* One only quotation shall now be added to show that Cranmer not only had himself views clearly and distinctly opposed to the doctrine in question, but also was so far from looking upon the matter as a question to be left open, that he regarded the doctrine as one to be utterly repudiated by the Reformed Church.

XI.

"The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of *transubstantiation*, of the REAL PRESENCE of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar, (as they call it,) and of the *sacrifice* and *oblation* of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead. WHICH ROOTS, IF THEY BE SUFFERED TO GROW IN THE LORD'S VINEYARD, THEY WILL OVERSPREAD ALL THE GROUND AGAIN WITH THE OLD ERRORS AND SUPERSTITIONS. These injuries to Christ be *so intolerable*, that no Christian heart can willingly bear them. Wherefore, seeing that many have set to their hand, and whetted their tools, to pluck up the weeds and to cut down the tree of error, I, not knowing otherwise how to excuse myself at the last day, have in this book set to my hand, and are with the rest, to cut down this tree, and to pluck up the

* "I am convinced that Cranmer at any rate did not maintain an Objective Presence of any kind." (Preface to Sequel, p. 7.)

weeds and plants by the roots, which our Heavenly Father never planted, but were grafted and sown in His vineyard by His adversary the devil, and Antichrist his minister." (Preface to Edit. 1550, P.S. 6.)

2. Parker.

Matthew Parker was born A.D. 1504; entered at Cambridge 1520. In 1534 he was made Chaplain to Queen Anne Boleyn, by whom, six days before her apprehension, he was charged with the care of her daughter Elizabeth. (Correspondence, P.S. Edit., pp. 59, 391, 400.) Hence, no doubt, his appointment on Elizabeth's accession, to the Archbishoprick of Canterbury, which very unwillingly (Ibid, p. 57) he was constrained to accept. Hence also his influence with Elizabeth, which he used for the removal, at the commencement of her reign, of the Crucifix and Lights from her chapel, (Ibid, pp. 97, 379; Zur. Letters, i., pp. 122, 129.) In conjunction with others, he also successfully remonstrated against Images. (Ibid, pp. 79—96.) The "Bishop's Bible" was prepared under his direction. In his archbishoprick the Reformed Prayer-book was revised, and the 39 Articles reduced to their present form. He was confessed a learned man, but his strictness in enforcing Conformity gave him an evil name with the Puritans. He died 1575.

Archbishop Parker has left us no publication bearing directly on the subject of these Papers. His doctrinal views will come under consideration in a future paper. For the present it may suffice to observe, (1,) That we owe to Parker the 29th of our present Articles,* the title of which is "Of the wicked which do not eat the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper;" and, (2,) that the book of Whitgift, from which the extracts below are taken, was written by Parker's appointment, and was submitted† to him for approval and correction,‡ so that on important doctrinal matters, at least, they must be regarded as substantially expressing the opinions of Archbishop Parker.

* See "Soames's Elizabethian History," pp. 157, 211. "Hardwick on Articles," p. 128.

† See "Neal's History of Puritans," i., p. 193. "Soames's Elizabethian History," pp. 174-5.

‡ "I have sent unto your Grace the first part of my book, which I beseech your Grace to peruse, and to *correct*, *alter*, *add*, or *take away*

3. Grindal.

Edmund Grindal was born 1519; educated at Cambridge, where he greatly distinguished himself. In 1550 Bishop Ridley appointed him one of his chaplains, together with Bradford and Rogers. In 1551 he was appointed chaplain to King Edward. On the death of Edward he took refuge on the Continent. Returning to England on the accession of Elizabeth, he was made Bishop of London in 1559 and in 1570 Archbishop of York, whence, on the death of Parker, in 1575, he was removed to Canterbury. He died in 1583.

The following are quotations from Grindal's writings:—

I.

"I will return to my former question, and prove more at large that Christ's body CANNOT BE EATEN OF THE WICKED. . . . . Moreover, Christ's body must be received WITH FAITH, and NOT WITH THE MOUTH, ... but wicked and impenitent persons lack faith, wherefore they CANNOT EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST." (Works, P.S., Edit. 58.)

II.

"Thus, by the Word of God, by reason, and by the old fathers, it is plain that sinful men EAT NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST, receive they the Sacrament never so oft." (Ibid, 59.)

III.

"Christ's body is food, not for the body, but for the soul; and therefore it must *be received with the instrument of the*

what you shall think convenient. . . . . My Lord of Lincoln hath perused the book, and so hath Dr. Perne, and they both like of it. . . . . If it will please your Grace to have me dedicate it to any, either the Queen's Majesty, the Parliament, or any other, I will stay until I hear from you." (Whitgift's Letter to Parker in P.S. Edit. of Whitgift, iii. 600.)

soul, which is faith. For as ye receive sustenance for your body by your bodily mouth, so the food of your soul must be received by faith, which is the mouth of the soul." (Ibid, 44.)

IV.

"And whereas you say that the Spirit hath no mouth, like as it hath no body or bones, you are deceived; for the *Spirit hath a mouth in its kind.* . . . . Whereof I will reason thus: Of whatsoever sort the mouth is, such is his food. But the mouth of the Spirit is spiritual, not bodily. Therefore it receiveth Christ's body spiritually, not bodily. And in like manner Christ, speaking of the eating of His body, nameth Himself the bread, not for the body, but of life, for the soul; and saith, 'He that cometh to me shall not hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.' Wherefore whoso will be relieved by the body of Christ, must receive Him as He will be received, with the instrument of faith appointed thereunto, not with his teeth or mouth. And whereas I say that Christ's body must be received and taken with faith, I mean not that you should pluck down Christ from heaven and put Him in your faith, as in a visible place, but that you must with your faith rise and spring up to Him, and, leaving this world, dwell above in heaven, putting all your trust, comfort, and consolation in Him, which suffered grievous bondage to set you at liberty and to make you free; creeping into His wounds, which were so cruelly pierced and dented for your sake. *So shall you feed on the body of Christ;* so shall you suck the blood

that was poured out and shed for you. This is the spiritual, THE VERY TRUE, the ONLY EATING of Christ's body. . . . . It is plain that Christ's body is meat for our spirit, and hath NOTHING TO DO WITH OUR BODY." (Ibid, 45, 46.)

V.

"Mark well what ye have said, for you have granted me great repugnance. First, you say, that no body, being not spiritual, can be in sundry places at once. Then say you, that at the Maundy Christ's body was not spiritual; and yet hold you, that He was there present, visible before the apostle's eyes, and in each of their hands and mouths all at one time, which grants of yours are not agreeable." (Ibid, p. 51.)

VI.

"Christ in a sacrament gave His own body to be eaten in faith. The priest, for lack of faith, receiveth accidents and dimensions. Christ gave a *sacrament* to strengthen men's faith; the priest giveth a *sacrifice* to redeem men's souls. Christ gave it to be eaten, the priest giveth it to be worshipped. And to conclude, Christ gave bread: the priest saith he giveth a God." (Ibid, p. 57.)

VII.

"I owe then this to you as an individual, that by the perusal of your treatise on the 'Origin of Error,' about twenty years since, I was first led to entertain a correct opinion respecting the Lord's Supper; whereas before that time I had adopted the sentiments of Luther on that sub-

ject. It is but just, therefore, that I should respect him from whom I have received so much benefit." (Letter to H. Bullinger, Feb. 8th, 1567. Zurich Letters, i. 182.)

These extracts are conclusive as to Grindal's own views. We have also sufficient testimony as to the fact of his regarding this matter as no open question in the Church of England. Writing to Bullinger, August 27th, 1566, he says, "We most fully agree with your Churches, and with the confession you have lately set forth." (Zurich Letters, i. 169.

Still more important is a letter written by him in conjunction with Bishop Horne, in answer to a false report which had been spread abroad on the Continent, that in the English Church the bread was not broken in common, but put into the mouth, and that the mode of spiritual manducation and of the presence of Christ's body in the sacred Supper was not to be explained, but to be left open.

The false report is contained in a letter from Bullinger and Gualter, in which it was said—

"Nunc vero audimus (utinam rumore falso) requiri . . . . Neque vero modum spiritualis manducationis, et presentiæ Coporis Christi in Sacra Cæna explicandum, sed relinquendum in medio."*

In answer to this letter the reply of Bishops Grindal and Horne states—

"Almost all these articles are falsely imputed to us. . . . . The Church of England, too, has entirely given up the use

* See "Soames's Elizabethian History," p. 68.

of [prayers in] a foreign tongue, breathings, exorcisms, oil, spittle, clay, *lighted tapers*, and other things of that kind, which, by the Act of Parliament are never to be restored. We entirely agree that women* neither can nor ought to baptise infants, upon any account whatever. In the receiving of the Lord's Supper, the laws require, custom sanctions, and our Anglo-Louvaine calumniators in their reckless writings bear us witness, that we break the bread in common to every communicant, not putting it into his mouth, but placing it in his hand. *They testify also to* OUR EXPLANATION *of the* MANNER OF THE SPIRITUAL FEEDING AND PRESENCE *of the body of Christ* in the holy Supper." (Zurich Letters, i. pp. 178, 179.)

* Grindal therefore did not understand the Rubric as it stood in Queen Elizabeth's reign, as allowing Baptism by women. On this matter there might be doubt. (See Hooker, Edit. Keble, ii. p. 277, sq.) Whitgift, however, agreed with Grindal. (See his Works, P.S. Edit. ii. 495, sq.; 535-6; iii. 493.) All doubt was taken away by the change in the Rubric made at the Hampton Court Conference, from "They baptise not children at-home in their houses," to "They procure not their children to be baptised at-home in their houses," with the addition, "Let the minister of the parish, (or in his absence, any other lawful minister that can be procured) with," etc. See also Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i., p. 397; and Soames's Elizabethan History, p. 535.

Whitgift.

John Whitgift was born about 1530, educated at Cambridge, at Pembroke Hall, where Ridley was Master, and Grindal and Bradford were fellows. Bradford was his tutor. He did not leave England, but escaped persecution during the reign of Queen Mary. In 1567, he was made chaplain to Queen Elizabeth. As Master of Trinity College, he was brought into antagonism with Thomas Cartwright, (T. C.,) the Puritan. Subsequently he wrote an answer to the "Admonition to the Parliament." Cartwright replied. And Whitgift in 1574, published the Defence of his Answer. In 1577 he was consecrated Bishop of Winchester. He refused to be removed to Canterbury during the lifeime of Grindal, who had incurred the Queen's displeasure; but accepted the archbishoprick on Grindal's death in 1583. He attended Queen Elizabeth on her death-bed, and crowned King James in 1603, was present at the Hampton Court Conference, and died in 1604.

I.

He wrote in answer to T. C. (*i.e.* Thomas Cartwright) :—

"I never heard that any learned man as yet misliked this place of Augustine;* but I know they have used it as a most manifest testimony against Transubstantiation and *the Real Presence*, and as a *true declaration* wherefore the sacramental bread and wine be called the Body and Blood of Christ, being but the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ." (Works, P. S. Edit. iii., p. 113.)

II.

"T. C.: *You would think you had wrong, if because some of those that favour that which you favour in this matter be*

* Whitgift had quoted (and T. C. had objected to the quotation) the well-known saying of Augustine, "As after a certain manner of speaking the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, is the Body of Christ; the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ, is the Blood of Christ; so the Sacrament of faith is faith."

either freewill men, or hold Consubstantiation in the Sacrament, you should be challenged as freewill men, or maintainers of Consubstantiation."

Jo. WHITGIFT (In answer)

"If there were either so many 'freewill men, or maintainers of the Consubstantiation,' as there be of the sect of the Puritans; or *if they were maintained and justified* by us, as the other be by you, then, surely you might justly charge us with their errors; else the reason is not like." (Works, vol. i., pp. 94-5-6.)

III.

T. C.: "*But the case standeth in this, that, forasmuch as the common and usual speech of England is, to note by the word 'priest' not a minister of the Gospel, but a sacrificer, which the minister of the Gospel* IS NOT; *therefore we ought not to call the ministers of the Gospel 'priests.'*"

Jo. WHITGIFT (In answer)

"I am not greatly delighted with the name, nor so desirous to maintain it; but yet a truth is to be defended. I read in the old fathers that these two names, *sacerdos* and *presbyter* be confounded. I see also that the learned and the best of English writers, such I mean as write in these our days, translate this word *presbyter* so; and the very word itself, as it is used in our English tongue, soundeth the word *presbyter*. As heretofore use hath made it to be taken for *a sacrificer*, so will use now alter that signification, and make it to be taken for *a minister of the*

*Gospel.** But it is mere vanity to contend for the name when WE AGREE OF THE THING: the name may be used, and not used without any great offence." (Works, vol. iii., p. 351.)

IV.

But we have most important testimony, not only of Whitgift's repudiating the doctrine of the Real Presence for himself but of the Church of England having *refused* it.

T. C. had said:—

"*Peter Martyr, upon the x chapter of the second book*

* The rejection of the words "altar," "sacrifice," and "priest," in the sacerdotal sense, will be found frequently recurring in the writings of our Reformers.

In another sense, however, there were those among the Reformers, English and Foreign, (including Beza,) as well as among our subsequent Divines, who were not afraid to speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice as well as a sacrament. This language, in which "sacrifice" has an extended meaning, led, no doubt, to a feeling very different from that of the Reformers, not only as to the *word* "altar," but to the thing signified by it; subsequently also, in some cases, to some real doctrinal confusion.

Hence, in respect of this matter, our English reformed theology may be said to flow in two channels—one stream keeping clear of the words "sacrifice" and "altar," using these words in their more limited sense, and denying that the Christian Church has any proper sacrifice; the other using the word sacrifice in its wider sense, and maintaining that though we have indeed no *propitiatory sacrifice*, yet there is no reason why the memorial of the *One Sacrifice*, and the offering of ourselves, and the sacrifice of praise, should not be regarded as included under *sacrifice proper*.

The language adopted by the first class has certainly the advantage of clearness. The distinction is very broad and deep between the two senses in which the other class uses the same word *sacrifice*.

The second class claims for its use of language the advantage of

of the Kings saith, that the Lutherans must take heed lest, whilst they cut off many popish errors, they follow Jehu by retaining also many popish things. For they defend still the Real Presence in the Bread of the Supper, and images, and vestments, etc.; and saith that 'religion must be wholly reformed to the quick.'"

In reply Whitgift says:—

"Mr. Martyr nameth the popish things which the Lutherans observe to be the Real Presence, *images, all*

employing the terms in the same sense as the ancient Christian Fathers.

The doctrinal difference between the two classes must not be magnified. Waterland distinctly classes himself with the second, and alluding to Hooker's assertion, that we have now properly "no sacrifice," he says, "I presume he meant by *proper* sacrifice, *propitiatory*, according to the *sense* of the Trent Council, or of the *new* definitions. In such a *sense* as that, he might justly say, that *sacrifice* is no part of the *church ministry*, or that the Christian Church has *no* sacrifice. But I commend not the use of such *new language*, be the meaning ever so right: the *fathers* never used it." (Work, Vol. v., p. 140.) Yet none could be more distinctly opposed than Waterland to the Eucharistic Sacrifice *in that sense*, in which it stands connected with the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence."

Archbishop Longley, in his posthumous charge has said: "The Romish doctrine of a true, real, and substantial sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, as it is called in the Council of Trent, entailed the used of the term *altar*. But this term appears nowhere in the Book of Common Prayer; and was, no doubt, omitted lest any countenance should be given to the sacrificial view. The notion, therefore, of making in the material elements a perpetual offering of the Body and Blood of Christ, is as foreign to the spirit and the letter of our service, as I hold it to be to the doctrine of the early Fathers, as well as of the leading Divines of our Church." (Page 26.)

the popish apparel which they used in their Mass, (for so doth he mean); which THIS CHURCH HAS REFUSED. What his opinion is of *this* apparel that *we retain* I have declared, Tract vii., chap. v., the 4th division; where he of purpose speaketh concerning the same. *God be thanked,* RELIGION IS WHOLLY REFORMED, *even to the quick,* IN THIS CHURCH." (Ibid, 550).

These extracts from the writings of men holding (either at the time of writing or subsequently) the position of highest authority in the English Church, are here brought forward as expressing the views of individual Reformers. But it may be worth while to observe in passing (what indeed can scarcely escape observation) that they possess a certain historical value besides. In the case of Cranmer none will dispute that we have statements of a certain doctrine, and of a certain repudiation of doctrine, quite sufficient to show us what would be the aim of one to whom it was given, in the Providence of God, more than to any other, to mould our Formularies and frame our Articles. And in the case of Grindal and Whitgift we have declarations of doctrine and repudiation of doctrine, not for themselves alone, but on the part of the English Church. Their statements are statements of what was and what was not the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England. Their words cannot be understood as declaring anything less than that the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence was excluded from the teaching of the English Church.

Add to this Parker's sanction of Whitgift's Book.* And if anything is needful to make it plain that such sanction extended to such statements concerning the doctrine of our Church, add the words of Parker himself: "We be in ONE UNIFORM DOCTRINE of the same."† (Letter to Cecil in Cor-

* See note above, pp. 22-3. Of Whitgift's "*Defence*" of his Answer Strype says distinctly that it "had the *careful inspection* of the *Archbishop* and other Bishops and learned men, before it passed abroad." (Strype's Parker, Book iv., chap. xxxviii., anno 1574, p. 364.)

† The letter relates to the form of bread used, praying Cecil to "help to pacify" the dissension which had arisen concerning this. Parker says, "How so many churches have of late varied I cannot tell; except it be the practice of the common adversary, the devil, to make variance and dissension in the sacrament of unity. For where we be in one uniform doctrine of the same, and so cut off much matter of variance which the Lutherans and Zuinglians do hatefully maintain, yet because we will have *some matter* of dissension, we will quarrel in a *small circumstance* of the same." Here is Parker's statement of our *unity of doctrine* only leaving room for dissension in the *circumstances* of administration. This doctrinal unity could not be, in his view, the Lutheran doctrine, for if so it would have been a unity actually excluding the doctrine, which the most cursory perusal must have shown him in the book which he approved of Whitgift. Then it must have been in Parker's view a oneness of doctrine excluding the "Real Presence" of Luther, or it could not have excluded the disputes of Lutherans and Zuinglians. There is therefore in this letter a statement of Parker, equivalent to the statement of Grindal and Whitgift, concerning the doctrine of the English Church.

If it should be argued that, at any rate, Parker's words look like a condemnation of Zuinglian as well as of Lutheran views, and sound as if he regarded the *one* doctrine of the Church of England as being neither Zuinglian nor Lutheran; then I answer, *One thing* is perfectly clear, and it is the one thing *material* for my argument. I mean, that Parker's "ONE DOCTRINE" is the *one doctrine* which was held in common both by Conformists and Nonconformists (in this matter) between whom (since there was *no doctrinal dissension*) the

respondence, p. 379.) And then I think it will appear that the question, whether or not this doctrine is the doctrine of the English Church, is *reduced to the question of the* TRUTH OR FALSEHOOD OF THREE SUCCESSIVE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY. I do not see how we can fail to acknowledge

seeds of discord were sown in a matter of no importance. About this much, I conceive, there can be no question whatever. And as little can there be that thus the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence is absolutely excluded from "the one doctrine" of the Church of England in Parker's view, and in his very distinct and emphatic statement. According to Parker's letter, the oneness of doctrine in England excludes dissension on doctrine; those who were puritanically disposed contending only about unimportant ceremonies, and finding no difference for which to contend in the matter of Eucharistic doctrine. But there could be no such thing as doctrinal agreement and oneness with the Puritans on the subject of the Lord's Supper, without the doctrine of Luther being excluded from that *oneness*. It seems, therefore, that there is actually no way of understanding this declaration of Archbishop Parker as being anything less than a distinct and positive denial that in the teaching of the Church of England there was any place or room for the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lutheran sense.

But this being so, it is, I conceive, quite possible that Parker may have meant his words to point a rebuke at Zuinglians as well as Lutherans, for the apprehension prevailed that the doctrine of Zuingle would leave in the sacraments nothing more than teaching ceremonies and empty signs; and such a view, no doubt Parker would have opposed, and opposed as *not* the doctrine of the English Church. So Hooker writes, "This was it that *some* did *exceedingly fear*, lest Zuinglius and Œdampadius would bring to pass, that men should account of this sacrament but *only* as of a *shadow, destitute, empty and void* of Christ." (Vol. ii., p. 349, Keble Edit.) And to the same effect Calvin as translated by Coverdale. "After this Zuinglius and Œdampadius begin to grow . . . . they applied all the force of their wit to impugn the same [*i.e.* the carnal presence] . . . . But whiles they were very much bent on this purpose, they omitted to declare, what presence of Christ in the Supper we ought

this, unless indeed we are prepared to maintain that Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift, were men altogether ignorant in this matter, and entirely mistaken as to what is and what is not the doctrine of the Church of England.*

Nay, more than this, such statements derive additional weight from the fact of their being not only spoken out with unquestioning, perfect, and, indeed, we may say, with surprising confidence, but also being allowed and accepted by Puritan adversaries, who would never have hesitated to deny them, if denial had been counted possible, or to ques-

to believe, and what communion of His body and blood is there received: insomuch that Luther supposed them willing to leave nought else but the bare signs, void of the spiritual substance. . . . . We perceive therefore, in what thing Luther erred, and also wherein Zuinglius and Œdampadius did err. . . . . For notwithstanding that they (Zuinglius and Œdampadius) denied not the verity, yet did they not teach it openly, as was beseeming. This do I understand, that whiles they gave themselves studiously and diligently to affirm that the bread and wine were called the body and blood of Christ, because they be the signs thereof, they thought not that they ought in the mean time to do this thing also, to add to that, they are the signs after such sort that the verity is nevertheless joined unto them. Neither did they declare that they went not about to deface the true communion which the Lord giveth us in His body and blood." (In Coverdale, "Fruitful Lessons," etc. P. S. Edit., pp. 463—465.)

* I can hardly think that any will seriously support the hypothesis that the Church of England *intended* to exclude the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, and *was fully persuaded* that she had excluded it; but that God by His Providence or His Spirit ordered, that, through inadvertence, certain loopholes should be left in the walls which the Church had built; or certain stones left, such as might serve to give hand-hold to those who would yet desire to enter in by getting over the fences which the Church had built for the purpose of excluding the doctrines which they would bring in. On such an hypothesis what heresy might not be fastened on the teaching of our Church?

tion them, if, in their judgment, the matter had admitted of question.

Nay, we may go further still, and say, that in the case of Whitgift at least, so far as his testimony was public, and not public only, but prominent—and prominent as the statement of one who was put forward * (in a manner) to be the public champion of the Church of England—so far too, as afterwards it acquired additional prominence by his exaltation to the archiepiscopal throne; so far his distinct statement, not being called in question by Puritan opponents, † not being disputed by other English theolo-

* See note above (on Parker). Neale says, "The *Bishops thought themselves* obliged to answer. Dr. John Whitgift, Master of Trinity College, and Vice-chancellor of Cambridge, *was appointed* to this work, which he performed with great labour and study, and *dedicated it to the Church of England*. His method was unexceptionable; the whole text of the admonition being set down in paragraphs, and under each paragraph the doctor's answer. Before it was printed it was *revised and corrected* by *Archbishop Parker*, Dr. Cooper bishop of Lincoln, and Tern bishop of Ely; so that in this book, says Mr. Strype, may be seen all the arguments for and against the hierarchy, drawn to the best advantage. Dr. Whitgift's book was answered by Mr. Cartwright, whose performance was called a masterpiece in its kind, and had the approbation of great numbers in the University of Cambridge, as well as foreign divines. Whitgift replied again to Cartwright, and *had the thanks of the bishops and the queen*, who, as a reward for his excellent and learned pains, made him Dean of Lincoln." (History of Puritans, i., p. 193.)

† There is abundant evidence that no such serious doctrinal matter was regarded as being in question between the Conformists and the Puritans. The early history of the disputes has to do only with ceremonies and habits. Neal, after carefully enumerating matters between them, says, "There was *no difference* in points of *doctrine* between the Puritans and Conformists." (Vol. i., p. 159.)

Compare Grindal's letter to Zanchius [1571 or 1572 probably,] "When first her Highness, Elizabeth, under most happy auspices

gians, not being disallowed by succeeding Convocations, not being protested against by subsequent Parliaments, but silently accepted and acknowledged by the whole body of the English Church, must, I think, be regarded as carrying

began her reign, the popish doctrine and worship being cast off, she restored all things to that standard of the administration of the Word of God, and the Sacraments and the whole of religion, which had been drawn up and established during the reign of Edward VI., of happy, but also of most lamented memory. To this all the states of the kingdom, with full consent, gave their voices in the great council of the nation, which in our vernacular language we call the Parliament. The authority of this council is so great, that the laws made therein cannot by any means be dissolved except by the sanction of the same. Whereas, then, in this form of religion of which I have spoken, drawn up by King Edward, there were many commands respecting the habits properly adapted to the ministers of the Church, and also concerning other things which some good men wish to be abolished or amended, it was forbidden by the authority of the law that any one should meddle with this matter. Yet the law itself allowed the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of the bishops, to alter some things. . . . . As for *doctrine*, hitherto we retain it unshaken and unadulterated in our Churches. And therefore, since *all our controversy* has flowed from *discipline*, these are the usual grounds of complaint. Ministers are required to wear commonly a long gown, a square cap, and a kind of tippet over the neck, hanging from either shoulder, and falling down almost to the heels. In public prayers and every sacred administration, besides the ordinary dress, the ecclesiastical discipline requires the minister to wear a linen garment, called by a new appellation, a surplice." (Grindal's Remains, P. S. Edit., pp. 338-9.) (See also the Letter of Grindal and Horn, Zur. Letters, i., p. 176. Also, Zur. Letters, i., pp. 134, 135, and 73, 74. See also Soames's Elizabethan History, pp. 455—458.) Other evidences may be seen in Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 739—741; and in Blakeney's "Book of Common Prayer," pp. 57—59, 128—130.

The following testimony is from Dr. Bridges, Dean of Salisbury, 1587. "The controversies between the common adversaries [the Papists] and us are *pro aris et focis*, for matters, and that capital

a weight, such as weighed in the balances of unprejudiced truth cannot easily be overborne.

And this testimony, let it be observed, is testimony to the doctrine of our Church at a period, and in a reign, which subsequent changes and subsequent legislation seem to recognize as containing the true date* of the substantial settlement of our doctrinal Formularies.

matters, of the substance and life of our Christian religion; not trifles as some neutrals would bear the people in hand. . . . . Whereas the controversies betwixt us and our brethren [the Puritans] are matters, or rather (as they call them) but manners and forms of the Church's regiment." (Defence, etc., quoted by Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 740, 741.)

* The Articles of the Church of England have never been altered since 1571. The changes in the Liturgy, made in 1604, were made by authority given to the Sovereign by virtue of the Act of Uniformity, Primo. Eliz. The Act of Uniformity, authorising the Prayer-book after the last review in 1662, speaks of the Book which it authorises, not as a Book then made, but as the Book of Elizabeth, with certain "additions and alterations."

The next Paper will be occupied with the writings of Reformers in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.

PAPERS ON THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

No. II.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS:

REFORMERS OF THE REIGNS OF HENRY VIII. AND EDWARD VI.

In this Paper will be found extracts from those Reformers alone who did not survive the reign of Queen Mary. Others, however, eminent in King Edward's reign, will find their place in the Paper following.

In some cases the extracts may be thought to be unnecessarily long. But there are some which seemed too valuable to be omitted, though the evidence, as to the writer's views, might be sufficient without them. All, however, will be found, it is believed, to have an important bearing, more or less distinct, on the question before us.

Tyndale.

Tyndale is here put first, as being the earliest of those divines, from whose writings extracts will be made.

William Tyndale was born, probably 1484, removed from Oxford to Cambridge, perhaps for the sake of Erasmus' Lectures. About 1520 became tutor to the family of Sir John Walsh, in Gloucestershire. In consequence of his opinions he left Gloucestershire, withdrawing to London, and then to Antwerp, where he translated the New Testament. Afterwards he was assisted by Coverdale in the commencement of a translation of the Old Testament. But through the interference of the English Government he was apprehended at

Antwerp, and in 1536 was brought to trial at Augsburg, and condemned to the stake. He was first strangled and then burnt. His last words were, "Lord, open the King of England's eyes."

In 1529 Sir Thomas More published a "Dialogue" defending the Romish doctrine of the Lord's Supper, "wherein he treated . . . . many things touching the pestilent sect of Luther and Tyndale, by the one begun in Saxony, and by the other labored to be brought into England." To this work "an answer" was published by Tyndale in 1531, and from this the first six following quotations are taken.

I.

"Here therefore it is to be noted diligently, that Christ *meaneth*, as every man may see, by the *eating of this bread*, none other thing than the *belief in Himself offered up* for our sins, which faith only justifieth us." (Answer to More, P. S. Edit. p. 226.)

II.

"Thus now may ye see how Christ's flesh, which He called bread, is the spiritual food and meat of our souls *when our souls* BY FAITH see God the Father not to have spared His only so dear beloved Son, but to have delivered Him to suffer that ignominious and so painful death, to restore us to life: *then have we eaten His flesh, and drunk His blood*, assured firmly of the favour of God, satisfied and certified of our salvation." (Ibid, p. 227.)

III.

"But now confer this saying to his purpose at the beginning, where He bade them work for that meat that should never perish, telling them that to believe in Him

whom God hath sent was the work of God; and whoso believeth in Him, should never thirst nor hunger, but have life everlasting. Confer also this that followeth, and thou shalt see it plain, that His words be understood spiritually of *the belief in His flesh crucified, and His blood shed;* for which belief we be promised everlasting life, Himself saying, 'Whoso believeth in me hath life everlasting.' Here, therefore, their question, 'How may this man give us his flesh to eat it?' is solved; even when He gave His body to be broken, and His blood to be shed. And *we eat and drink it indeed, when we believe stedfastly that He died for the remission of our sins:* Austin and Tertullian to witness." (Ibid, p. 228.)

IV.

"And now, Christian reader, to put thee clean out of doubt that Christ's BODY is NOT *here* PRESENT *under the form of bread*, (as the Papists have mocked us many a day,) but in heaven, even as He rose and ascended; thou shalt know that He told His disciples, almost twenty times between the thirteenth and eighteenth chapters of John, that He should and would go hence and leave this world." (Ibid, p. 251, 252.)

V.

"And thus we there have Christ *present*, in the inward eye and *sight of our* FAITH. We *eat His body and drink His blood;* that is, we *believe* surely that *His body was crucified for our sins, and His blood shed for our salvation.*" (Ibid, p. 236.)

VI.

"For if our Papists take eating and drinking here bodily, as to *eat the natural body of Christ under the form of bread, and to drink His blood under the form of wine;* then must all young children (that never came to God's board) departed, and all laymen that never drank His blood, be damned." (Ibid, p. 237, 238.)

VII.

Wherefore, seeing that all the doctors with one accord call the sacrament so earnestly *a sacrifice*, they cannot otherwise understand than that they so say after the use of the Scripture only, because it is the *memorial of the sacrifice of His death and blood shedding.* Why should they then of right be offended, if we understand the doctors after the same manner, when they call it His body and blood; and that they so call it after the use of the Scripture, because that it is *only a memorial* of His body and blood?" (Doctrinal Treatises, P. S., Edit. p. 372.)

VIII.

"There is a word called in Latin *sacerdos;* in Greek *hiereus,* in Hebrew *Cohan,* that is, a minister, an officer, a sacrificer or a priest; as Aaron was a priest, and sacrificed for the people, and was a mediator between God and them. And in the English should it have had some other name than priest. . . . . Another word is there in Greek, called *Presbyter,* in Latin *senior,* in English an *elder,* and is nothing but an officer to teach, and not to be a mediator between God and us. This needeth no anointing of man. They of the Old Testament were anointed with oil, to

signify the anointing of Christ, and of us through Christ with the Holy Ghost. .... By a priest then, in the New Testament, understand nothing but an *elder* to teach the younger, and to bring them unto the full knowledge and understanding of Christ, and to minister the sacraments which Christ ordained, which is also nothing but to preach Christ's promises." (Ibid, pp. 255, 256, 257.)

Ridley.

Nicholas Ridley was born 1500, and educated at Cambridge. During an absence of three years from England he made acquaintance with several of the Early Reformers. He became chaplain to Cranmer in 1537. He was made bishop of Rochester in 1547, and removed in 1550 to London, where he exerted his influence for the removal of altars. He was committed to the Tower in July 1553, and burnt at Oxford Oct. 16, 1555. The charge against him was that he had affirmed, and openly defended and maintained (1) that the true and natural body of Christ, after the consecration of the priest, is not really present in the sacrament of the altar. (2) That in the sacrament of the altar remaineth still the substance of bread and wine. (3) That in the Mass is no propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. (See Works, P. S. edit., p. 271.)

Ridley's views have a claim on our careful attention peculiarly their own. For Ridley may be called the master-mind of the English Reformation in the reign of Edward VI. The Romanists said "Latimer leaneth to Cranmer, Cranmer to Ridley, and Ridley to the singularity of his own wit."* And though Ridley modestly would have himself regarded as far inferior to Cranmer; yet Cranmer himself declared that he owed his altered views of the Lord's Supper to conferences with Ridley.†

* See Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., pp. 283, 284.

† "I grant that then I believed otherwise than I do now; and so I did, until my lord of London, doctor Ridley, did confer with me, and,

But besides this, the attempts which have been made to represent Ridley as teaching the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence," make it specially important that we should not mistake what Ridley's teaching really was. Hence our quotations from him will be somewhat copious.

I.

* "I acknowledge gladly the true body of Christ to be in the Lord's Supper, in such sort as the Church of Christ (which is the spouse of Christ, and is taught of the Holy Ghost, and guided by God's word) doth acknowledge the same. But the true Church of Christ doth acknowledge a presence of Christ's body in the Lord's Supper to be communicated *to the godly by grace*, and *spiritually*, as I have often shewed, and by a *sacramental signification;* but *not by the corporal presence of the body of His flesh.*" (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 236.)

II.

"True it is, every sacrament hath grace annexed unto it instrumentally. But there is divers understanding of

by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors, drew me quite from my opinion." (Cranmer's Works, Remains, P. S. Edit., p. 218.) See also Lord's Supper, Appendix, p. 6. John Ab Ulmis, therefore, seems in error in ascribing Cranmer's change of views to A. Lasco (Orig. Letters, II., p. 383) who, however, may, very probably, have had some hand in it, for he had, no doubt, considerable influence with Cranmer. (See Blakeney on Prayer Book, pp. 80, 81.) Ridley's own change of view was due to the study of Bertram. (See Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 206, and ix.)

* The extracts for the most part are from the Disputation at Oxford in April 1555, about six months before Ridley was put to death.

that word '*habet*,' '*hath* :' for the sacrament *hath not grace included in it;* but *to those that receive it well*, it is turned to grace. After that manner the water in baptism hath grace promised, and by that grace the Holy Spirit is given: not that grace is included in water, but that grace cometh by water." (Ibid, p. 240.)

III.

"I grant also that there is no promise made to bread and wine. But inasmuch as they are sanctified, and made *the Sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord*, they have a promise of grace annexed unto them; namely, of spiritual partaking of the body of Christ to be communicated and given, *not to the bread and wine*, but *to them which worthily do receive* the sacrament." (Ibid, p. 240.)

This sacrament hath a promise of grace, made to *those that receive it worthily*, because grace is given by it, as by an instrument; *not that Christ hath transfused grace into the bread and wine.*" (Ibid, p. 241.)

IV.

* "I, being fully by God's word thereunto persuaded, confess Christ's natural body to be in the sacrament indeed by spirit and grace, because that whosoever receiveth worthily that bread and wine, receiveth effectuously Christ's body, and drinketh His blood (THAT† IS, HE IS MADE EFFECTUALLY PARTAKER OF HIS PASSION); and you make a

* This from Ridley's "Examination," had before the Queen's commissioners a month before his death.

† The parenthesis is Ridley's. The capitals are the Editor's.

grosser kind of being, enclosing a natural, a lively, and a moving body, *under the shape or form of bread and wine.* Now, this difference considered, to the question thus I answer, that in the sacrament of the altar is the natural body and blood of Christ *vere et realiter,* indeed and really, for *spiritually, by grace and efficacy;* for so *every worthy receiver receiveth the very true body of Christ.* But if you mean *really and indeed,* so that thereby you would include a lively and a moveable *body under the forms of bread and wine,* then, in that sense, is NOT CHRIST'S BODY IN THE SACRAMENT *really and indeed.*" (Ibid, p. 274.)

V.

"This doctrine maintaineth a real, corporal, and carnal presence of Christ's flesh, assumed and taken of the Word, to be in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that not *by virtue and grace* only, but also by the *whole essence and substance of the body and flesh of Christ.*

But SUCH A PRESENCE DISAGREETH FROM GOD'S WORD *from the rule of faith,* and cannot but draw with it many absurdities." (Ibid, p. 197.)

VI.

"It destroyeth and taketh away the institution of the Lord's Supper, which was commanded only to be used and continued UNTIL THE LORD HIMSELF SHOULD COME.* If,

* Compare Bradford:—"He biddeth us use His Supper in the remembrance of His death and passion, preaching it out 'TILL HE COME,' whereby He doth us to wit that corporally *He is not there in the form of bread*: therefore saith Paul 'TILL HE COME.'" (P. S. Edit., I., p. 394, and Hooper "DONEC VENERIT. Duo D. Paulus hisce

therefore, *He be now really present in the body of His flesh*, then must *the Supper cease:* for a remembrance is not of a thing present, but of a thing *past and absent.* And there is a difference between remembrance and presence, and, as one of the fathers saith, 'A figure is in vain where the thing figured is present.'" (Ibid, p. 199.)

VII.

"The circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy and proportion of the Sacraments, and the testimony of the faithful fathers, ought to rule us in taking the meaning of the holy Scripture touching the sacrament.

"But the words of the Lord's Supper, the circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy of the sacraments, and the sayings of the Fathers, do most effectually and plainly prove

verbis Ecclesiam Christi docet. . . . . Christum ipsum, Cujus mortem per cœnam hanc exprimimus, *re ipsa corpore* cœnæ suæ *non adesse*. Dicit Enim 'DONEC VENERIT.'" (P. S. Edit., II., p. 448; see also I., p. 515.) And Becon, "The Apostles had put in these words, 'TILL HE COME, (that is to say, unto the judgment) in vain,' if Christ's natural body were present in the Supper. For, 'after His coming,' saith Theodoretus, 'we shall have no more need of symbols, signs, or sacraments, when *His very body shall appear:* and therefore said he TILL HE COME.'" (P. S. Edit., Prayers, etc., p. 370.) And Bullinger. "Paul saith, 'Declare the Lord's death TILL HE COME.' For thus we gather thereby: He, whose remembrance is repeated UNTIL HE COME *or return*, He surely is not counted to be present." (P. S. Edit., V., p. 446.) So Bishop Morton on the Eucharist "UNTIL HIS COMING AGAIN: meaning *corporally* at the last day. Which word [UNTIL] being spoken of a last day, doth exclude your coming again of Christ in His *corporal Presence* every day," p. 217. The same argument is ably pressed by Mr. Richardson, in his lecture on Ritualism. (Hatchard) p. 78.

a *figurative speech* in the words of the Lord's Supper; *Ergo*, A FIGURATIVE SENSE AND MEANING *is specially to be received* in these words, "This is my body." (Ibid, p. 205.)

VIII.

"I grant that Christ did both; that is, both took up His flesh with Him ascending up, and also did leave the same behind Him with us, but after a diverse manner and respect. For He took His flesh with Him, after *the true and corporal substance of His body and flesh:* again, He left the same in *mystery to the faithful in the Supper*, to be received after a spiritual communication, and by grace. *Neither is the same received in the Supper only, but also* AT OTHER TIMES, BY HEARING THE GOSPEL, AND BY FAITH.* For the 'bread,' which we break, is the communication of the body of Christ: and generally, 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye shall have no life in you." (Ibid, p. 222.)

IX.

Ward:—"He gave to us His flesh to be eaten, the which He took of the earth, in which also here He walked, etc.

* Compare the following:—

Ridley:—"I am well content to grant, that Christ left much greater things to us than Elias to Eliseus, albeit He be said to have left His double Spirit with Him; for that the strength and grace of the body of Christ, which Christ ascending up here left with us, is the only salvation and life of all men which shall be saved: *which life* Christ hath here left into us, to be *received by faith through the hearing of the word*, and the right administration of the sacraments. *This virtue and grace* Chrysostom, after the phrase and manner of John the evangelist, *calleth Christ's flesh.*" (Ibid, p. 221.)

But He never gave His flesh to be eaten, but when He gave it at His Supper, saying, 'This is My Body.'"

"*Ergo*, in the Eucharist He gave us His flesh."

Ridley:—"You do allege the place of Augustine upon Psalm xcviii., where he saith, that Christ gave His flesh to be eaten which He took of the earth, and in which here He walked; inferring hereupon that Christ *never gave the same His flesh to be eaten, but only in the Eucharist*: I DENY your minor; for He gave it both in the Eucharist to be eaten, and *also otherwise*, AS WELL IN THE WORD, *as also upon the cross*." (Ibid, p. 234.)

X.

"And I also *worship Christ* in the sacrament; but *not because He is included* in the sacrament: like as I *worship Christ also in the Scriptures*, not because He is really included in them. Notwithstanding I say, that the body of Christ is present in the sacrament; but yet *sacramentally* and *spiritually* (according to His grace) giving life, and *in that respect* REALLY, that is, according to His benediction, giving life." (Ibid, pp. 235, 236.)

XI.

"Again I say, like as the bread of the sacrament and of thanksgiving is called the body of Christ given for us; so the cup of the Lord is called the blood which sprang from the side of Christ: but that sacramental bread *is called the body*, because it is *the sacrament of His body*. Even so likewise the cup *is called the blood* also, which flowed out of

Christ's side, because it is *the Sacrament of that blood* which flowed out of His side, instituted of the Lord Himself for our singular commodity, namely for our spiritual nourishment; like as baptism is ordained in water to our spiritual regeneration."

Curtop :—"The sacrament of the blood is not the blood."

Ridley :—"The *sacrament* of the blood is *the blood;* and that is *attributed to the sacrament,* which is spoken of *the thing of the sacrament.*"

Weston :—"That which is in the chalice, is the same which flowed out of Christ's side. But there came out very blood."

"*Ergo,* There is very blood in the chalice."

Ridley :—"The blood of Christ is in the chalice indeed, but NOT *in* THE REAL PRESENCE, but by grace, and *in a sacrament.*"*

* Compare Jewel "Defence of Apology," P. S. Edit., p. 467. "The author that beareth the name of Chrysostom saith thus, 'The *very body* of Christ is not in the holy vessels; but the *Sacrament of that Body* is therein contained.' Here have we Chrysostom against Chrysostom: the one saith 'Christ's body is in the vessels;' the other saith 'Christ's body is not in the vessels.' And as touching the mouth, St. Augustine saith, 'The body of Christ requireth the hunger of the inner man;' 'by inward drinking I am blessed;' 'this bread entereth not into the belly:' 'to believe in Christ, that is to eat the bread of life.' Thus we see that Christ's body is in the vessels, and yet not in the vessels; in the mouth, and yet not in the mouth. These contradictions may *easily be reconciled, if a man be acquainted with the phrases of the ancient writers.* . . . . As Chrysostom saith here, 'Christ's body is in the vessels;' even so Athanasius saith, 'Our Lord is in the words of the Scriptures;' St. Augustine saith, 'Holy men receive Christ in their hands and in

Weston :—"That is very well. Then we have blood in the chalice."

Ridley :—"It is true; but by *grace*, and in a *sacrament*." (Ibid, pp. 237, 238.)

XII.

Watson :—". . . . The fathers say, that evil men do eat Him which descended from heaven."

Ridley :—"They eat Him indeed, but *sacramentally*. The Fathers use many times the *sacrament* for the *matter of the sacrament*, and all that same place maketh against you: and so here he cited the place. . . . ."

Weston :—"Chrysostom saith, that the same punishment remaineth to them which receive the body of the Lord unworthily, as to them which crucified Him."

Ridley :—"That is, because they defile the Lord's body: for evil men do eat the body of Christ *sacramentally*, but good men eat both the *sacrament* and the *matter of the sacrament*." (Ibid, pp. 247, 248.)

XIII.

Watson :—"But the Lamb of God lieth on the table."*

Ridley :—"It is *a figurative speech;* for in our mind we understand *Him which is in heaven*."

their forehead;' St. Chrysostom saith, 'The priest beareth the Holy Ghost;' St. Augustine saith, 'The people is laid upon the communion table; the people is in the cup;' St. Gregory saith, 'Abel by signification bare Christ in his hands.' . . . . Thus is Christ's *body present*, not REALLY, nor in *substance*, but ONLY *in mystery*."

* Quoting from Gelasius, Hist. Conc. Nic., cap. xxx., πίστει νοήσωμεν κεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκείνης τὸν ἀμνὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Watson :—"But He lieth there, the Greek word is κεῖται.

Ridley :—"He lieth there; that is, He is there present, *not corporally*, but He lieth there by His *operation*."

Watson :—"He lieth; but His operation lieth not."

Ridley :—"You think very grossly of the sitting or lying of the celestial Lamb on the table of the Lord: for we may not imagine any such sitting or lying upon the table, as the reason of man would judge; but all things are here to be understood spiritually. For that heavenly Lamb is (as I confess) on the table; but by a spiritual presence, by grace, and *not after any corporal substance of His flesh* taken of the Virgin Mary. And indeed the same canon doth very plainly teach, that the bread which is set on the table is material bread; and therefore it (the canon, I mean) commandeth that we should not creep on the ground in our cogitation, to those things which are set before us; as who should say, what other things are they (as much as pertaineth to their true substance) than bread and wine? 'But rather,' saith the canon, 'lifting up our minds into heaven, let us consider with faith the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world, sitting or lying upon the table.' 'For a lifted up faith,' saith he, 'seeth Him which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, after the true manner of a body set by grace on the Lord's table, and taking away the sins of the world. For I think you mean not so; as though the Lamb did lie there prostrate with His members spread upon the table.'" (Ibid, pp. 248, 249.)

XIV.

Ridley :—"Moreover, there is ambiguity in this word, 'really,' whether it be to be taken as the logicians term it, 'transcendenter;' that is, most generally; and so it may signify *any manner of thing which belongeth to the body of Christ, by any means : after which sort* we also grant Christ's body to be *really* in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (as in disputation, if occasion be given, shall be declared), or whether it be taken to signify the *very same thing, having body, life, and soul,* which was assumed and taken of the Word of God into the unity of person. *In which sense,* SINCE THE BODY OF CHRIST IS REALLY IN HEAVEN, *because of the true manner of His body,* it *may* NOT be said to be here in the earth." (Ibid, p. 196.)

XV.

Ridley :—"We do handle the signs *reverently :* but we *worship* the sacrament *as a sacrament,* not as a thing signified by the sacrament."

Glyn :—"What is the symbol or *sacrament ?*"

Ridley :—"*Bread.*"

Glyn :—"Ergo, We worship bread."

Ridley :—"There is a deceit in this word 'Adoramus.' We *worship* the symbols, when *reverently we handle them.* We worship Christ wheresoever we perceive His benefits; but we understand His benefits to be greatest in the sacrament."

Glyn :—"So I may fall down before the bench here, and

worship Christ; and if any man ask me what I do, I may answer, I worship Christ."

Ridley :—"We adore and worship Christ in the Eucharist. And if you mean the *external sacrament;* I say, that also is to be worshipped * *as a sacrament.*" (Ibid, p. 236.)

* It is sufficiently obvious that the word *worship* is used here in that lower sense which still clings to the word *worshipful*. So Sir John Cheke writing to Parker says: "The University hath not done so great honour to Mr. Bucer, as honesty and *worship* to themselves." (See Correspondence of Parker in P. S. Edit., p. 44. Compare our translation of δόξα in Luke xix. 10. See also note in Blakeney on Common Prayer, p. 450.)

At the Hampton Court Conference, "Dr. Reynolds excepted at those words in the Office of Matrimony; 'with my body I thee worship.' The king, perusing the place, said, he was made to believe this phrase imported no less than divine worship; but upon enquiry he found the words sink to a much lower and inoffensive sense: 'A gentleman of worship' being a customary expression with the English; and thus it agrees with the Apostle's precept of giving honour to the wife, etc.'" (Collier's Eccles. Hist., vii., p. 294.) With Ridley's words here may be compared those of Cranmer: "As for 'the reverent use of man's mouth' in the Lord's holy Supper, the bread and wine outwardly must be reverently received with the mouth, because of the things thereby represented, which by faith be received inwardly in our hearts and minds." (On Lord's Supper, p. 174., P. S. Edit.) And these sayings of Ridley and Cranmer may be regarded as furnishing the only answer which can be needful to the argument, that the Church of England must be understood to teach the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, because of the care she takes for the reverent treatment of the consecrated elements, requiring them to be covered "with a fair linen cloth;" and directing "the priest, with such other communicants as he shall call unto him . . . . . immediately after the blessing, reverently" to "eat and drink" what may remain. (See Pusey, "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," p. 229—232. See also "Sequel to

XVI.

Ridley:—"Of Christ's REAL PRESENCE there may be a *double understanding.* If you take the REAL PRESENCE of Christ according to *the real and corporal substance which He took of the Virgin,* THAT PRESENCE *being in heaven* CANNOT BE ON THE EARTH ALSO. But if you mean a REAL PRESENCE, 'secundum rem aliquam quæ ad corpus Christi pertinet,' *i. e.,* according to *something that appertaineth to Christ's body, certes* the ascension and abiding in heaven are no let at all to *that presence.* Wherefore Christ's Body, *after that sort,* is here present to us in the Lord's Supper; by grace I say, as Epiphanius speaketh it." . . . .

Ridley:—"Master doctor, this argument is nothing worth. I do not so straitly tie Christ up in heaven, that He may not come into the earth at His pleasure: for when He will, He may come down from heaven, and be on the earth, as it liketh Himself. Howbeit I DO AFFIRM, that it is NOT POSSIBLE *for Him to be* BOTH IN HEAVEN AND EARTH at one time." (Ibid, p. 213.)

XVII.

"If *(I say) the true solution of that former question, whereupon all these controversies do hang, be, that the

Kiss of Peace," pp. 307, 315, and Grueber, "Reply to Dr. Heurtley," p. 18.) Cranmer and Ridley both alike rejected the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. But both alike also held that the outward elements in the Eucharist were to be "worshipped" or "reverently used." In like manner the author of the Diallecticon, (quoted in Oxford Catena, p. 24,) says, "A double worship is defined, one, that which we pay to God; the other, that which we give to signs and divine mysteries."

* This and the following are from "A brief declaration of the Lord's Supper" written by Ridley in the time of his imprisonment.

natural substance of bread is the material substance in the sacrament of Christ's blessed body. . . . Then also the natural substance of Christ's human nature, which He took of the Virgin Mary, *is in heaven*, where it reigneth now in glory, and *not here* inclosed *under the form of bread*. Then that *godly honour*, which is only due unto God the Creator, *may* not be done unto the creature without idolatry and sacrilege, IS NOT TO BE DONE UNTO THE HOLY SACRAMENT. Then also the *wicked*, I mean the impenitent, murderer, adulterer, or such-like, DO* NOT RECEIVE THE NATURAL SUBSTANCE OF THE BLESSED BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST." (Ibid, p. 12.)

XVIII.

"By grace (I say,) that is, by the gift of this life, (mentioned in John;) and the *properties of the same* meet for our pilgrimage here upon earth, *the same body of Christ is here present with us*. Even as, for example, we say the same sun, which, in substance, never removeth his place out of

* The reader will not fail to mark here Ridley's *distinct denial* of the reception of the "Res Sacramenti" by the wicked, and herein also the true explanation of the words quoted above, where he said that they eat the Body of Christ *sacramentally*, (*i. e.*, as giving to the *Sacrament* the name of *the matter of the Sacrament*. See below at the end of this paper.) Archdeacon Martin has said, "The citation of Bishop Ridley for this doctrine, (*i. e.*, the reception by the wicked) is, as if one should cite the noble army of martyrs in favour of a denial of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Answer to the Bishop of Salisbury, p. 219.)

To make Ridley's views on this matter still more unmistakeable, let the reader be asked to compare the following.

"It [*i.e.* this carnal presence] maketh precious things common to profane and ungodly persons, and constraineth men to confess many *absurdities*. For it affirmeth, that whoremongers and murderers, yea, and (as some of them hold opinion) the *wicked and faithless*, mice, rats, and dogs also, *may receive the very real and corporal body of the Lord*, wherein the fulness of the Spirit of light and grace dwelleth: contrary to the manifest words of Christ in six places and sentences of John vi." (Ridley's Works, p. 199.)

the heavens, is yet present here by his beams, light, and natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth. For God's Word and His Sacraments be, as it were, the beams of Christ, which is *Sol justitiæ*, the Sun of Righteousness." (Ibid, p. 13.)

XIX.

"I know that all these places of the Scripture are avoided by two manner of subtle shifts: the one is, by the distinction of the bloody and unbloody sacrifice, as though our unbloody sacrifice of the Church were any other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a shewing forth and a sacramental representation of that one only bloody sacrifice, offered up once for all." . . . . "The meaning of the Fathers was . . . . that the WHOLE *substance of our* SACRIFICE which is frequented of the Church in the Lord's Supper, consisteth in prayers, praise, and giving of thanks, and in remembering and shewing forth of that sacrifice once offered upon the altar of the Cross; that the same might continually be had in reverence by mystery, which once only, and no more, was offered for the price of our redemption." (Ibid, pp. 210, 211.)

XX.

"The *form of a table shall more move the simple from

* This and the following are taken from Ridley's "Reasons" accompanying his "Injunctions," 1550, in which was forbidden the "*shewing the Sacrament* openly before distribution, or *making any elevation thereof;* ringing of the sacrying bell, or *setting any light on the Lord's board;* and in which the curates, church-wardens, and questmen were exhorted "to erect and set up the Lord's board after the form of an honest table, decently covered, in such place of the quire or chancel, as shall be thought most meet." (See pp. 319, 320.)

the superstitious opinions of the popish Mass, unto the right use of the Lord's Supper. For the use of an altar is to *make sacrifice* upon it; the use of a table is to serve for men to eat upon. Now, when we come unto the Lord's board, what do we come for?—*to sacrifice Christ again*, and to crucify Him again, or to feed upon Him that was once only crucified and offered up for us? If we come to feed upon Him, spiritually to eat His body, and spiritually to drink His blood (which is *the true use* of the Lord's Supper), then no man can deny but *the form of a table is more meet for the Lord's board, than the form of an altar.*" (Ibid, p. 322.)

XXI.

"The form of an altar was ordained for the sacrifices of the law, and therefore the altar in Greek is called θυσιαστήριον *quasi sacrificii locus.* But now both the law and *the sacrifices* thereof *do cease:* wherefore the *form of the altar* used in the altar *ought to cease* withal." (Ibid, p. 323.)

"And so appointed he the form of a right table to be used in his diocese, and in the Church of Paul brake down the wall standing then by the high altar's side." (Fox. See Ridley's Works, p. 324.) King Edward's letter may be seen in Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., Appendix vi., p. 507; requiring and specially charging, and commanding "to give substantial order throughout all your diocese, that, with all diligence, all the altars in every church or chapel be taken down; and instead thereof, a table to be set up in some convenient part of the chancel." Early in Elizabeth's reign the bishops drew up a paper of reasons against altars: and the Queen issued injunctions "that the holy table, in every church, be decently made and set up in the place where the altar stood .... and so to stand, saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed, at which time the same shall be so placed, in good sort within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants." (See Cardwell's Doc. Annals, i., p. 201.)

XXII.

Ridley:—"As for the taking down of the altars, it was done upon just considerations, for that they seemed to come too nigh to the Jews' usage: neither was the Supper of the Lord at any time better ministered, [or] more duly received, than in those latter days when all things were brought to the rites and usage of the primitive Church."

Lincoln:—"A goodly receiving, I promise you, to set an oyster-table* instead of an altar, and to come from puddings at Westminster, to receive: and, yet when your table was constituted, you could never be content, in placing the same now east, now north, now one way, now another, until it pleased God of His goodness to place it clean out of the church."

Ridley:—"Your lordship's unreverend terms do not elevate the thing. Perhaps some men come more devoutly

* Compare Becon, "Heretofore we were taught to beat down the idolatrous and heathenish altars which Antichrist of Rome, intending to set up *a new priesthood* and *a strange sacrifice* for sin, commanded to be built up. . . . But now, the sacrificing sorcerers shame not, both in their private talk and in their open sermons, spitefully to call the Lord's table *an oyster board;* and therefore have taken out of the temples those *seemly tables* which we, following the examples of Thy dearly beloved Son, and of the Primitive Church, used at the ministration of the Holy Communion, and they have brought in again their altars: and upon those they sacrifice and offer daily, say they . . . . Thy dear Son Christ for the sins of the people."—(Supplication for the Restoring of God's Word. Works, P. S. Edit., Prayers, etc., p. 229.)

from puddings, than other men now do from other things."* (Ibid, p. 281.)

* The following is from Ridley's last Farewell, written probably between October 1st and October 16th, when he was burned: "It was during this interval that Lord Dacre offered ten thousand pounds to the queen if she would spare Ridley's life." (Ed., P. S. Edit., p. 395, note.) "This Church of England had of late, of the infinite goodness and abundant grace of Almighty God, great substance, great riches of heavenly treasure, great plenty of God's true and sincere word, the true and wholesome administration of Christ's holy Sacraments, the whole profession of Christ's religion truly and plainly set forth in baptism, the plain declaration and understanding of the same taught in the holy catechism, to have been learned of all true Christians. This church had also a true and sincere form and manner of the Lord's Supper, wherein, according to Jesus Christ's own ordinance and holy institution. Christ's commandments were executed and done. For upon the bread and wine set upon the Lord's table thanks were given, the commemoration of the Lord's death was had, the bread in the remembrance of Christ's body torn upon the Cross was broken, and the cup in the remembrance of Christ's blood shed was distributed, and both communicated unto all that were present and would receive them; and also they were exhorted of the minister so to do. All was done openly in the vulgar tongue, so that everything might be both easily heard and plainly understood of all the people to God's high glory; and the edification of the whole church. This church had of late the whole Divine service, all common and public prayers ordained to be said and heard in the common congregation, not only framed and fashioned to the true vein of Holy Scripture; but also all things so set forth, according to the commandment of the Lord and St. Paul's doctrine, for the people's edification, in their vulgar tongue. It had also holy wholesome Homilies, in commendation of the principal virtues which are commended in Scripture; and likewise other homilies, against the most pernicious and capital vices that useth, (alas!) to reign in this realm of England. This church had, in matters of controversy, Articles so penned and framed after the Holy Scripture, and grounded upon the true understanding of God's Word, that in short time, if they had been universally received, they should

LATIMER.

Hugh Latimer was born in 1470. In 1535 he was appointed Bishop of Worcester. He resigned his bishopric and retired into the country on the passing of the Six Articles. He was very popular in the reign of Edward VI. On Mary's accession he was tried with Ridley for heresy. The articles against him were these: "That thou hast openly affirmed, defended, and maintained, that the true and natural body of Christ, after the consecration of the priest, is not really present in the sacrament of the altar, and that in the sacrament of the Altar remaineth still the substance of bread and wine." Latimer replied, "After a corporal being, which the Romish Church furnisheth, Christ's body and blood is not in the sacrament under the forms of bread and wine." He was burnt at Oxford, October 16th, 1555, with Ridley, to whom he said, "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as, I trust, shall never be put out."

---

have been able to have set in Christ's church much concord and unity in Christ's true religion, and to have expelled many false errors and heresies wherewith this church (alas!) was almost overgone. But, (alas!) of late . . . . in the stead of the Lord's holy table they give the people, with much solemn disguising, a thing which they call their Mass; but in deed and in truth it is a very masking and mockery of the true Supper of the Lord, or rather I may call it a crafty juggling, whereby these false thieves and jugglers have bewitched the minds of the simple people, that they have brought them from the true worship of God unto *pernicious idolatry;* and make them to believe that to be Christ our Lord and Saviour, which, indeed, is neither God nor man, nor hath any life in itself; but in substance is the creature of bread and wine, *and in use of the Lord's table is the sacrament of Christ's body and blood;* and for this holy use, for the which the *Lord hath ordained them* in His table to *represent unto us* His blessed body torn upon the Cross for us and His blood there shed, it pleased Him *to call them* His body and blood, which understanding Christ *declareth to be His true meaning*, when he saith, 'Do this in the remembrance of Me.'" (Ibid, pp. 399—401.)

The first four of the following Extracts are taken from the Disputation at Oxford, April, 1554.

I.

"The conclusions whereunto I must answer are these:—

1. "The first is, that in the sacrament of the altar, by the virtue of God's Word pronounced by the priest, there is really and naturally the very body of Christ present, as it was conceived of the Virgin Mary, under the kinds of bread and wine. And, in like manner, His blood [in the cup.]

"To these I answer:

"Concerning the first conclusion, methinketh it is set forth with certain new terms, lately found, that be obscure, and do not sound according to the Scripture. Nevertheless, however I understand it, thus do I answer, although not without peril [of my life.] I say, That there is *none other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence;* and this presence is sufficient for a Christian man, as the presence by the which we both abide in Christ, and Christ in us, to the obtaining of eternal life, if we persevere [in His true Gospel.] And the same presence may be called a *real presence*, [because to the *faithful believer* there is the real, or spiritual body of Christ]: which thing I here rehearse, lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me, with the Anabaptist, to make nothing else of the Sacrament but a bare and naked sign. As for that which is feigned of many, I, for my part, take it for a Papistical invention. And therefore I think it utterly to be rejected [from among

God's children, that seek their Saviour in faith; and be taught among the fleshly Papists, that will be again under the yoke of Antichrist."] (Remains, P.S. Edit., pp. 251, 252.)

II.

Weston:—"The time hath been when you said Mass full devoutly."

Latimer:—"Yea, I cry God mercy heartily for it."

Weston:—"Where learned you this newfangleness?"

Latimer:—"I have long sought for the truth in this matter of the Sacrament, and have not been of this mind past seven years: and my lord of Canterbury's book hath especially confirmed my judgment herein. If I could remember all therein contained, I would not fear to answer any man in this matter." (Ibid, p. 265.)

III.

Tresham:—"Now, that the truth may the better appear, ... here I ask of you, whether Christ, speaking these words, did mean of His flesh to be eaten with the mouth, or of the spiritual eating of the same?"

Latimer:—"I answer, (as Augustine understandeth) that Christ meant of the spiritual eating of His flesh."

Tresham:—"Of what flesh meant Christ? His true flesh, or no?"

Latimer:—"Of His true flesh, *spiritually to be eaten*, in the Supper, *by faith*, and not corporally." (Ibid, p. 266.)

IV.

"He gave not His body to be received with the mouth, but He gave *the Sacrament of His body* to be *received with the mouth:* He gave *the Sacrament to the mouth, His* BODY TO THE MIND."—(Ibid, p. 267.)

V.

"He sheweth unto us how we shall eat Him, in what manner and form; namely, *spiritually*, to *our great comfort:* so that whosoever eateth the mystical bread, and drinketh the mystical wine worthily, according to the ordinance of Christ, *he receiveth surely the very body and blood of Christ spiritually*, as it shall be most comfortable unto his soul. He *eateth with the mouth of his soul*, and *digesteth with the stomach of his soul*, the body of Christ. And to be short: *whosoever believeth* in Christ, putteth his hope, trust, and confidence in Him, *he eateth and drinketh Him:* for the *spiritual eating is the right eating* to everlasting life; not the corporal eating, as the Capernaites understood it. For that same corporal eating on which they set their minds, hath no commodities at all: it is a spiritual meat that feedeth our souls." (Sermons, P.S. Edit., pp. 458, 459.)

VI.

"So likewise go to the Lord's Supper: when the bread is consecrated, when the words are spoken over it, then it is such an office that it *beareth the name of the body and blood of Christ.* Like as the magistrates because of their office are called Dii, 'gods,' so the bread presenteth His body, so

that we go unto it worthily, and receive it with *a good faith. Then* we be assured that *we feed upon Him spiritually.* And like as the bread nourisheth the body, so THE SOUL FEEDETH *upon the very body and blood of Christ by faith,* BY BELIEVING HIM TO BE A SAVIOUR *which delivered man from his sin.*" (Sermon in Remains, P. S. Edit., p. 127.)

VII.

"So that it is needless to have such offerers. . . . . What meaneth St. Paul, when he saith, 'They that preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel'? Whereas he should (rather) have said, The Lord hath ordained, that they that sacrifice* at Mass, should live of the sacrificing. . . . . For I am sure, if God would have had a new kind of sacrificing priest at Mass, then He or some of His apostles would have made some mention thereof in their Master, Christ's will. . . . . But He spake never a word of sacrificing, or saying of Mass; . . . . Therefore, sacrificing priests should now cease for ever: † for now all men ought to offer their own bodies a quick sacrifice, holy and acceptable before God." (Ibid, pp. 254, 255.)

VIII.

‡ "If Christ offered in His Supper, for whom, I pray

* Cf. Ridley's Works, P.S. Edit., p 107; and Geste, in Dugdale's Life, p. 113.

† Contrast "The Church of the World," in which is lamented "the practical change which has turned our clergy from a sacrificing priesthood into a preaching ministry." (p. 236.)

‡ This is from the conference between Ridley and Latimer (given in Ridley's Words, P. S. Edit., p. 103, sq.) during the time of their imprisonment.

you? For all. Then His latter oblation made on the cross cannot be thought to be done for all men, for it was not done for them for whom the oblation was made in the Supper; except, peradventure, He offered twice for the self-same, and that should argue the unperfectness of the sacrifice. 'Feed ye, as much as in you lieth, the flock of Christ:' nay, sacrifice rather for the flock of Christ, if the matter be as it is pretended; and it is marvel that Peter did forget so high an office, seeing in these days sacrificing is so much esteemed, preaching almost nothing at all. Who art thou, if thou ceasest to feed? A good catholic. But who art thou, if thou ceasest to sacrifice and say mass? At the least, an heretic! From whence come these perverse judgments, except, peradventure, they think that in sacrificing they feed, and then what needeth a learned pastor? Seeing no man is so foolish, but he can soon learn to sacrifice and say mass. Paul wrote two epistles to Timothy, and one to Titus, two clergymen. He made also a long sermon *ad clerum*, but not one word of this mass sacrifice, which could not have been done, if there had been such a one, and so highly to be esteemed. I have read over of late the New Testament three or four times deliberately; yet can I not find there neither the Popish consecration, nor yet their transubstantiation, nor their oblation, nor their adoration, which be the very sinews and marrow-bones of the Mass. Christ could not be offered, but propitiatorily; yet now, *Hoc facite*, 'Do this,' must be as much as to say, 'Sacrifice and offer My body under a piece of bread,' available, but

we cannot tell how much. Ah! thieves, have ye robbed the realm with your sacrifice of lands and goods; and now cannot tell how much your sacrifice is available?" (Latimer, in Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 112.)

Ponet.

John Ponet, (or Poynet, or Poinet) born 1516, was eminent among the Reforming Theologians of the reign of Edward VI. The Catechism, called Edward the Sixth's Catechism, was from his pen. It was published by Royal Authority under the advice of Cranmer and Ridley. He was made bishop of Rochester in 1546, and removed to Winchester in 1551. On the accession of Mary he retired to Strasburg, where he died in 1556.

We take the name of bishop Ponet next after Ridley and Latimer, on account of the importance attached to his testimony, and the claim which has been made upon it by those who maintain the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

I.

"And whosoever *eateth this flesh and drinketh this blood* with the *mouth of belief, that this very flesh of Christ was put to death for him, and this very blood was once shed for him,* he shall have everlasting life, and the Lord will raise him again at the latter day." (Quoted in Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 783.)

II.

"There is another kind of eating of Christ's body, and drinking of His blood, and that is called eating and drinking *sacramentaliter*, sacramentally. And we eat Christ on this fashion as oft as we join the outward signs of bread and wine, (that is to say) the Sacrament of the Holy Communion

with our faith and inward belief, receiving a visible testimony of our inward belief in the face of the congregation." (Ibid, pp. 783, 784.)

III.

"Wherefore thus I may conclude, he that believeth, eateth; and HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT, EATETH NOT, *although he eat the sacrament every day in the week.* (Ibid, p. 784.)

IV.

"And for the maintenance of this their erroneous and antichristian opinion they will not stick to say, that Christ's body may be in sundry places at one time, granting that it may be at Rome, at Paris, in London, in Canterbury, and in a thousand other diverse places at once.

"Whereas if ye read the Scriptures through, ye shall *never find,* that Christ's BODY was in TWO *places at* ONE *time,* or that after His resurrection it appeared in TWO *sundry places at* ONE *time.*" (Ibid, p. 785.)

V.

"We must take heed (saith St. Austin) that we do not so affirm the divinity of His manhood, that we take away thereby of the TRUTH of His BODY. And St. Austin doth plainly affirm that this body must be in one place of heaven, whereas it pleaseth His Divine Majesty to be." (Ibid, p. 785.)

VI.

"Why, but what mean I to say so? This gear seemeth to be quite contrary to all that ever I have said before;

His body is in heaven, and His body is present at the ministration of the sacrament of His Supper. These sayings seem to be directly repugnant the one of them to the other. To put you out of doubt on this point, ye shall understand that even as the sun which is far off distant is absent from mine eye and yet is present to my sight, even so is Christ's body ABSENT FROM MY MOUTH and yet PRESENT TO MY BELIEF. For my belief ascendeth into heaven, even to that body of Christ which sitteth there at the right hand of God the Father, which is His very true and no fantastical body, flesh, blood, and bone as it was born of the Virgin Mary.

"And when I receive the Holy Communion, *Mea conversatio est in cœlis:* my conversation is in heaven: where Christ's body is even so present to my faith as the sun is present to my sight, and as the bread and wine be present to my mouth. *So that if I have no faith,* CHRIST IS NOT PRESENT TO ME *when I receive the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.* If I have faith, Christ's body being in heaven in one only place, is PRESENT TO MY FAITH; and when I receive the Holy Communion I embrace Him by faith, even flesh, blood and bone as He was born of the Virgin Mary. And so do all men throughout the whole world hang upon Him, and comfort themselves with that only body, being in one place of heaven, though they be dispersed into never so many sundry places throughout the world." (Ibid, 787.)

Diallacticon.

The following Extracts from the Diallacticon are given in this place, because it has been commonly ascribed to Ponet. But it was certainly not his, and Dean Goode has shewn that there can be little doubt that the author was Sir Anthony Cooke.* (On Eucharist, ii., pp. 777, sq.)

I.

"And this also doth make much the more, that the sacrament is most worthy to have the name of the true body and blood, seeing not only outwardly it showeth forth a figure and image of it, but also inwardly it draweth with it a hid and secret natural property of the same body, that is to say, a virtue that giveth life: so that it cannot now be thought a vain figure, or the sign of a thing clean absent, but the very body of the Lord, divine indeed and spiritual, but present in grace, full of virtue, mighty in operation. And it happeneth often, that the names of the THINGS *themselves* be given to their VIRTUE and STRENGTH. We say leaven is in the whole lump, whereas a small quantity of leaven cannot spread so far abroad, but the strength and sharpness of the leaven. We say that the fire doth warm us, when the heat of the fire doth it, we being a good way off from the fire.

* "Whose private views on this subject are certainly not a test of what is the doctrine of our Church." (Goode, p. 782.) "The doctrine advocated in the Diallacticon, is not that a of Real Presence of the body and blood themselves in or under the Elements, but only the Presence of their virtue or influence." (Ibid, p. 778.)

Likewise that the sun is present, doth lighten, burneth, nourisheth, when indeed the HEAT of the sun doth it, and the SUN HIMSELF *cannot* go out of his sphere. So is a king said to be in all his realm, because of the power of his dominion." (Quoted from Goode on Eucharist ii., pp. 778, 9.)

II.

"When it is received (as the same Fathers have diligently observed), with this distinction between the proper or assumed body of Christ, and *His symbolical body*, as *the Sacrament of His body*, we do not err against the analogy of faith, which is not at all destroyed, inasmuch as we assign to each body its own attributes. For we say that the proper and assumed body is in place, and is circumscribed by space, *after the manner of* A TRUE BODY. . . . Nothing prevents the truth of the *symbolical body* notwithstanding, because it is a *divine* and *spiritual thing*, from being as widely diffused as the celebration of the sacrament. .. Besides which *no absurdities* accompany this doctrine, as many do the gross *transubstantiation*, AS WELL AS THE CARNAL CONJUNCTION WITH THE BREAD."* (Quoted from Cantena, [*Parker, Oxford,*] p. 27.)

* The following is a quotation from the posthumous Charge of Archbishop Longley, who attributes (by error) the Diallacticon to Ponet: "Bishop Poynet is often quoted as great authority by those who hold high views as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice. But he too gives us a clue to his real meaning in the following passage, whatever strong expression he may elsewhere have used in another direction. 'Ipsa Cypriani verba satis indicant, quàm non sequenda sit litera in his quæ de hoc mysterio dicuntur, quàm procul arcendus est

Philpot.

John Philpot, born in 1511, a great Hebrew scholar, was admitted 'true fellow' of New College, Oxford, in 1534. He spent some time in foreign travel, and on his return gave evidence of the change in his religious views. Gardiner bishop of Winchester would have suppressed his teaching, but could not. In Edward's reign he was made Archdeacon of Winchester. In Mary's reign he was imprisoned, and burnt at Smithfield, Dec. 18, 1555. In Bonner's address to him, he said "You have offended and trespassed against the Sacrament of the Altar, denying the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood to be there, affirming also material bread and material wine to be in the sacrament, and not the substance of the body and blood of Christ" (See Examination, P. S. Edit. p. 151.)

The following Extracts are from Philpot's Examinations before the Queen's Commissioner's, commencing October 1555, the same year in which he suffered.

I.

"But bodily to *be present*, and bodily to *be absent*; to be *on earth*, and to be *in heaven*, and all at *one present time;* be things CONTRARY TO THE NATURE OF A HUMAN BODY: ergo, it cannot be said of the human body of Christ, that the selfsame body is both in heaven, and also in earth at one instant, either VISIBLY OR INVISIBLY." (Examinations, P. S. Edit. p. 208.)

carnis sensus, et ad sensum spiritualem omnia referenda, huic pani Divinæ virtutis præsentiam adesse, vitæ æternæ effectum, Divinam infundi essentiam, verba spiritum et vitam esse, spirituale documentum tradi, hoc corpus, hunc sanguinem et carnem, hanc substantiam Corporis, non communi more, nec ut humana ratio dictat, accipi oportere, sed ita nominari, existimari, credi, propter eximios quosdam effectus, virtutes, et proprietates conjunctas, quæ copori et sanguini Christi naturâ insunt, nempe quòd pascat animas nostras, et vivificet simul, et corpora at resurrectionem et immortalitatem præparet.'" (p. 36.)

II.

"I allow the Church of Geneva, and the doctrine of the same; for it is *una, catholica, et apostolica*, and doth follow the doctrine that the apostles did preach; and THE DOCTRINE TAUGHT AND PREACHED IN KING EDWARD'S DAYS WAS ALSO ACCORDING TO THE SAME. And are ye not ashamed to persecute me and others for your Church's sake, which is Babylonical, and contrary to the true Catholic Church?" (Ibid, 153.)

III.

"Wherefore, unless you can declare by the word, that Christ is otherwise present with us than spiritually and sacramentally by grace, as He hath taught us, you *pretend* THE OMNIPOTENCY OF GOD IN VAIN."

London:—"Why, wilt thou not say that Christ is *really present* in the Sacrament? or do you deny it?"

Philpot:—"I deny not that Christ is *really in the sacrament* TO THE RECEIVER THEREOF according to Christ's institution." (Ibid, 62.)

IV.

Chedsey:—"Why, then you would not have it to be the body of Christ, *unless it be received?*"

Philpot:—"No, VERILY, it is NOT the very body of Christ *to any other*, but such as *condignly* RECEIVE THE SAME *after his institution*." (Ibid, p. 67.)

V.

Chamberlain:—"I pray you, my Lord, let me ask him

one question. WHAT KIND OF PRESENCE *in the sacrament* (duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance) do you allow?"

Philpot:—"If any come worthily to receive, then do I *confess* THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST wholly to be, *with all* THE FRUITS OF HIS PASSION, *unto the said* WORTHY RECEIVER, by the Spirit of God, and that Christ is thereby joined to him and he to Christ." (Ibid, p. 68.)

VI.

"But the sacrament be to be considered according to the word which Christ spake of them; of the which, 'Take ye, and eat ye' be some of the chief, concurrent to the making of the same, without the which there can be no sacraments." (Ibid, p. 61, 69.)

VII.

Philpot:—"Error, that I know, I hold none: of the Catholic Church I am sure I am."

Worcester:—"The Catholic Church doth acknowledge a REAL PRESENCE of Christ in the sacrament, and so will not you."

Philpot:—"That is not so: for I acknowledge a VERY ESSENTIAL PRESENCE in the sacrament duly used."

Worcester:—"What! a real presence?"

Philpot:—"Yea, A REAL PRESENCE *by the Spirit of God in the* right administration." (Ibid, p. 130.)

VIII.

Philpot:—"I do acknowledge (as I have said) a REAL

PRESENCE *of the sacrament*, in the due administration thereof, to THE WORTHY RECEIVERS, by the Spirit of God. (Ibid, 132.)

Chedsey :—"..... I hear say you do confess A REAL PRESENCE: but I will be hanged, if you will abide by it: you will deny it by and by."

Philpot :—"That I have said, I cannot deny; neither intend, whatsoever you say."

Chedsey :—"If there be A REAL PRESENCE in the sacrament, then EVIL MEN RECEIVE CHRIST: which thing you will not grant, I am sure."

Philpot :—"I deny the argument; for I do not grant in THE SACRAMENT by transubstantiation ANY REAL PRESENCE, as you falsely imagine; but in *the due administration to* THE WORTHY RECEIVERS." (Ibid, p. 133.)

IX.

Christopherson :—"Doth not St. Augustine call it the sacrament of the altar? How say you to that?"

Philpot :—"That maketh nothing for the probation of your sacrament. For so he, with other ancient writers, do call the Holy Communion or Supper of the Lord, in respect that it is the sacrament of the sacrifice which Christ offered upon the altar of the cross, the which sacrifice all the altars and sacrifices done upon the altars in the old law did prefigure and shadow; the which pertaineth nothing to your sacrament hanging upon you altars of lime and stone."

Christopherson :—"No doth? I pray you what signifieth "altar?"

Philpot:—"Not as you falsely take it materially, but but for the sacrifice of the altar of the cross." (Ibid p. 119.)

Bradford.

John Bradford, born probably about 1510, entered the Inner Temple as a student of common law 1547, when his character underwent a great change, through the instrumentality, it is said, of his friend Sampson. A year after Ridley invited him to be a fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1549. In 1550 Ridley, then Bishop of London, obtained for him a license to preach, made him one of his chaplains, and lodged him in his own house. In 1551 he was appointed one of the six chaplains of Edward VI., chosen to be "*itineraries*, to preach sound doctrine in all the remotest parts of the kingdom." On the accession of Mary he "still continued diligent in preaching, until he was unjustly deprived of both his office and liberty." He wrote to the men of Lancashire and Cheshire from his prison—"The chief thing which I am condemned for as an heretic is, because I deny in the sacrament of the altar (which is not Christ's Supper, but a plain perversion, as the Papists now use it) to be a real, natural, and corporal presence of Christ's body and blood under the forms and accidents of bread and wine; that is, because I deny transubstantiation, which is the darling of the devil, and daughter and heir to Antichrist's religion." "He endured the flame as a fresh gale of wind on a hot summer's day, without any reluctancy, confirming by his death the truth of that doctrine he had so diligently and powerfully preached during his life."

The first Extract is from a Sermon on the Lord's Supper, which appears to have been submitted to Ridley "to peruse and judge thereof." In returning it, Ridley wrote (1554) "Blessed be God that hath given you liberty . . . . that you may use your pen to His glory, and to the comfort, as I hear say, of many." (See Sermons, etc., P. S. Edit., p.82.)

I.

"If there be no substance of bread in the sacrament, but transubstantiation, *then Christ's body is* RECEIVED OF THE

UNGODLY and eaten with their teeth: which is *not only against St. Austin* calling this speech, "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man," etc., to be "a figurative speech;" but also AGAINST THE PLAIN SCRIPTURES, which affirm them to dwell in Christ and Christ in them, and they *to have everlasting life that eat Him;* which *the wicked have not*, although they eat the sacrament. 'He that eateth of this bread,' saith Christ, 'shall live for evermore.' Therefore *they* EAT NOT CHRIST'S BODY, but, as Paul saith, 'they eat judgment and damnation;' which I trow be *another manner of thing than Christ's body.* And this doth St. Austin affirm, saying, '*None* DO EAT CHRIST'S BODY, which is not in the body of Christ;' that is, as he expoundeth it, 'in whom Christ dwelleth not, and he in Christ:' which thing THE WICKED DO NOT, because they want *faith and the Holy Spirit, which be* THE MEANS WHEREBY CHRIST IS RECEIVED." (Sermons, etc., Parker Society Edition, p. 91.)

II.

* "'Why,' quoth he, 'didst thou not deny Christ's presence in the sacrament?'

"'No,' quoth Bradford, 'I never denied nor taught, but that TO FAITH whole *Christ's body and blood* was as present as bread and wine TO THE DUE RECEIVER.'

"'Yea, but dost thou not believe that Christ's body naturally and *really is there, under the form of bread and wine?*'

"'My lord,' quoth Bradford, 'I believe *Christ is present*

* This is from Bradford's last examination, Jan. 30, 1555. He was condemned the next day, and burnt July 1.

there to the FAITH *of the due receiver:* as for transubstantiation, I plainly and flatly tell you, I believe it not.'

"Here was Bradford called *diabolus*, 'a slanderer;' 'For *we ask* NO QUESTION,' quoth the lord-chancellor, "of transubstantiation, but of CHRIST'S BODILY PRESENCE.'

"'Why,' quoth Bradford, 'I deny not *His presence to* THE FAITH OF THE RECEIVER, but *deny* that He is INCLUDED IN THE BREAD, or that the bread is transubstantiated.'

"'If He be not included,' quoth the Bishop of Worcester, 'how is He then present?'

"'Forsooth,' quoth Bradford, 'my faith knoweth how, though my tongue cannot express it, nor you otherwise than by faith hear it, or understand it.'

"Here was much ado now, one doctor starting up and speaking this, another that, and the lord-chancellor talking much of Luther, Zuinglius, and Œcolampadius: but still Bradford kept them at this point, that *Christ is* PRESENT TO FAITH, and that there is no transubstantiation nor *including of Christ in the bread:* but all this would not serve them.

"Therefore another bishop asked this question,—*Whether the* WICKED MAN RECEIVED CHRIST'S VERY BODY OR NO? And Bradford answered plainly, 'No.' Whereat the lord-chancellor made a long oration, how that *it could not be that Christ* WAS PRESENT, except that the *evil man receive Him.*

"But Bradford put his oration away in few words, that grace was at that present offered to his lordship, although he received it not: 'So that,' quoth he, '*the receiving* MAKETH NOT THE PRESENCE, as your lordship would affirm; but *God's grace, truth, and power, is the cause of* THE

PRESENCE, the which the *wicked* THAT LACKETH FAITH CANNOT RECEIVE.' " (Ibid, pp. 488, 489.)

III.

* "'Your Church hath taken something too much upon her to excommunicate me for that which, by the testimony of my lord of Duresme in his book of the Sacrament lately put forth, was free of many an hundred years after Christ, to believe or not believe.'

"'What is that?' quoth he.

"'Transubstantiation,' said I.

"'Why, you are not condemned therefore only,' quod he.

"'*Yes*,' quoth I, '*that am I*, and *because I deny that* WICKED MEN DO RECEIVE CHRIST'S BODY.' †

* The two following extracts are from the Conference with Harpsfield, Feb. 16, 1555.

† In Bradford's case the articles of accusation appear to have been somewhat exceptional. Our Reformers were usually condemned—(1) For denying the real corporal presence; (2) For maintaining that bread and wine remain; (3) For denying the sacrifice of the mass. In some cases the *third* charge was omitted, in some cases also the *second;* the *first*—the denial of the corporal presence—seems regularly to have *stood first*. Tyndale has said: "The first [*i.e.* the Papists], though they have slain so many in and for defence of their opinion, yet they are ready to receive the second sort [*i.e.* the Lutherans] to fellowship, not *greatly striving* with them or *abhorring the presence of bread and wine with the very body and blood*, so that they yet by that means may keep him there still." (Doctrinal Treatises, pp. 367, 368.) Mr. Garbett, in his valuable lecture, "The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, the Key-note of the Reformation," (Hatchards,) says: "The articles of accusation in the most prominent cases of martyrdom have been providentially preserved to us, and we find them again and again to turn on the denial of the corporal

"'No,' quoth he, 'you agree not with us *in the presence*, nor in nothing else.'

"'How you believe,' quoth I, 'you know: for my part, *I confess a presence of whole Christ*, God and man, *to the faith of the receiver*.'

"'No,' quoth he, 'you must believe A REAL PRESENCE *in the sacrament*.'

presence in the first place, and the denial of transubstantiation only in the second. The first stands as the prominent charge, and in many cases the whole charge; and the other was but the sequel to it. The two accusations are embodied in separate articles, and the corporal presence is invariably first, as it must necessarily be. . . . As a matter of fact, not only where the two questions are both made the ground of accusation is the denial of the corporal presence the prominent charge, but there are numerous instances where the denial of the corporal presence is the only ground of accusation, and transubstantiation is not directly mentioned; while if we turn to the great leaders of the time—to Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, and their ever-memorable disputations at Oxford—still the fact is the same. With each of them three propositions were proposed for discussion, and with some slight verbal variations they are in substance the same in each case. Here again it is the corporal presence on which the whole argument depends. The propositions maintained against Cranmer were as follows:—'First, In the sacrament of the altar is the natural body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and also His blood, present really under the forms of bread and wine, by virtue of God's word pronounced by the priest. Secondly, There remaineth no substance of bread and wine after the consecration, nor any other substance but the substance of God and man. Thirdly, The lively sacrifice of the Church is in the mass propitiatory as well for the quick as the dead.' Everywhere you will observe the order is the same. The real, true, substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements, is the prominent point. IT WAS NOT SO MUCH AGAINST TRANSUBSTANTIATION AS AGAINST THE CORPORAL PRESENCE, THAT THE SAINTS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION PROTESTED TO THE DEATH." (Pages 13, 14.)

"'In the Sacrament?' quoth I. 'No, I will not shut Him up, nor *tie Him to it*, otherwise than *faith seeth* and permitteth. If I should *include Christ's* REAL PRESENCE in the sacrament, or *tie Him to it* otherwise than to THE FAITH OF THE RECEIVER, then THE WICKED MAN SHOULD RECEIVE HIM; which I DO NOT, nor WILL NOT believe by God's grace.'" (Ibid, pp. 510, 511.)

IV.

"'The wicked,' saith Master Harpsfield, 'do receive the VERY BODY OF CHRIST, but NOT THE GRACE *of His body*.'

"'No,' quoth I, '*they receive* NOT THE BODY; for Christ's body is no dead carcass: *he that receiveth it receiveth the Spirit*, which is not without grace, I ween.'" (Ibid, p. 512.)

V.

* "Here Master Pendleton was something abashed, as appeareth by his fumbling in his speech.

"'Master Bradford,' quod he, 'I do not know wherefor you are condemned.'

"'Marry,' quod I, '*transubstantiation is the thing whereof I am condemned*, and also *the denial of* WICKED MEN TO RECEIVE CHRIST'S BODY.'" (Ibid, p. 542.)

VI.

* "'You deny *the presence*,' quoth my lord of York.

"'I do *not*,' quoth I, 'to *the faith of the worthy receiver*.'

* This is from the Conference with Pendleton, March 28, 1855.

† This from Conference with Heath and Day, Feb. 22, 1855.

"'Why,' quoth he, 'what is that than to say that Christ LIETH NOT ON THE ALTAR?'

"'No, my lord,' quoth I, 'indeed I BELIEVE NOT SUCH A PRESENCE.'" (Ibid, p. 522.)

VII.

* "Cui Articulo ipse Bradford respondendo dixit, That Christ is present in the sacrament when the sacrament is duly ministered; and that Christ is present in the sacrament by faith, to faith, and in faith, and none otherwise; and saith that Christ is not in the sacrament by transubstantiation; and saith that simply he believeth no transubstantiation; also that it is not the body of Christ but to him that receiveth it; and that an evil man doth not receive it *in formâ panis;* and that after and before the receipt there is the substance of bread." (Ibid, p. 585.)

VIII.

"The sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of the world was not simply 'His body and His blood,' but 'His body broken and His blood shed;' that is, all His passion and suffering in His body and flesh. In that therefore they offer, as they say, the same sacrifice which Christ offered, dearly beloved, do they not, as much as in them is . . . . . crucify Christ again? . . . . . .

Whereas they call this sacrifice of the mass, the principal mean to apply the benefit of Christ's death to the quick and dead, I would gladly have them to shew, where and of whom

* This is from Bradford's sentence.

they learned it. Sure I am, they learned it not of Christ, for when He sent His disciples abroad to apply unto men the benefit of His death, He bade them not mass it, but preach the Gospel, as the mean by the which God had appointed believers to be saved." (Letters and Treatises, P. S. Edit., p. 287.)

Hooper.

John Hooper (or Hoper or Houper) was born about the close of the fifteenth century. He was educated at Oxford, and embraced the monastic life. After the dissolution of the monasteries was kindly received at Zurich by Bullinger. In 1548 he returned to England and was nominated to the bishopric of Gloucester in 1550. On Mary's accession he was committed to the Fleet, in Sept. 1553. He was condemned in Jan. 1555, taken to Gloucester, and burnt near to his own cathedral. Foxe says "Tunstall asked him to say 'whether he believed the CORPORAL PRESENCE in the sacrament, and Master Hooper said plainly that there was none such, neither did he believe any such thing.' Whereupon they bade the notaries write that he was married and would not go from his wife, and that he believed not the CORPORAL PRESENCE in the sacrament: therefore he was worthy to be deprived of his bishopric."

The first Extract is from "A brief and clear Confession of the Christian faith," first published in 1550.

I.

"I believe that *all this Sacrament consisteth* in *the use thereof;* so that without the *right use* the bread and wine *in nothing differ* from other common bread and wine that is commonly used; and therefore I do *not believe* that the *body of Christ* can be *contained, hid, or inclosed* in the bread, *under the bread,* or *with the bread;* neither the blood *in the*

wine, under the wine, or with the wine. But I believe and confess the very body of Christ to be in heaven on the right hand of the Father (as before we have said); and that always and as often as we *use this bread and wine* according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, *we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood.*

I believe that this receiving is not done *carnally or bodily,* but *spiritually,* through a *true and lively faith;* that is to say, the body and blood of Christ are not *given* to the *mouth and belly* for the nourishing of the body, but *unto* OUR FAITH for the nourishing of the spirit and inward man unto eternal life. And for that cause we have *no need that Christ should come from heaven to us, but that we should ascend unto Him,* lifting up our hearts through a lively faith on high unto the right hand of the Father, where Christ sitteth, from whence we wait for our redemption; and we must not seek for Christ in these bodily elements.

"I believe that this Holy Supper is a sacrament of faith unto *the faithful only,* and not for the infidels: wherein a man findeth and receiveth no more than he bringeth with him, saving peradventure the increase of faith, grace, and virtue. And therefore they only find and receive Jesus Christ unto salvation, which through true and lively faith bring the same with them: but the others find and *receive* ONLY THE OUTWARD AND VISIBLE SIGNS, and that to their condemnation, as Judas and other such like wicked and reprobate." (Later Writings, P. S. Edit., p. 49.)

II.

"Which sacrament is not a bare sign and token of His death only, as many men imagine, as the picture of Hercles is Hercles, or the image of Jupiter to be Jupiter: but I put as much difference between the sacraments of Christ, and all other signs and tokens not appointed for sacraments, as I do between the seal of a prince, that is annexed unto the writing or charter that containeth all the prince's right and title that he hath unto his realm, and the king's arms painted in a glass window. Such seals, annexed unto so weighty writings, be no less esteemed than the whole right, title, or claim that is confirmed by the seal, though the matter of the seal be nothing but wax, not for the value of the matter, (for twopence will buy ten times as much wax,) but for the use that the matter is appointed unto. And he that would take upon him to deny the king's seal in such a purpose, and say, it is but a piece of wax, it were no less than treason, and a very contempt of the king himself; because the king hath appointed that seal to be *honourably received and reverently used of all men.* And as the writings sealed doth confirm and declare the right of the owner unto all the world; so doth the sacraments confirm the assurance of everlasting life unto the faithfuls, and declareth the same to all the world. And as the matter, substance, and land itself is *not corporally nor really contained* in the writing, nor *annexed to the writing*, neither *brought* (when any matter of controversy is for the land) before the judge *with the writing; no more is the* CORPORAL BODY OF CHRIST *brought*

before the Church, NEQUE CUM PANE, NEQUE IN PANE, NEQUE SUB PANE, NEQUE PER PANEM, NEQUE ANTE PANEM, NEQUE POST PANEM.

"But when the minister delivereth unto me the thing that is in his power to deliver, to say, the bread and wine, rehearsing the words of Christ's institution, the Holy Ghost *delivereth unto my faith*, which is mounted and ascended into heaven, the PRECIOUS BODY AND BLOOD OF MY SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST *spiritually, and not corporally*. So doth *the merits of this precious body* in *heaven feed my poor wretched soul upon the earth;* and *no contradiction or impossibility for Christ's body so to do*. It may be in heaven, and yet *extend* HIS VIRTUE by the operation of the Holy Ghost into my soul, *by the means of faith*, which at the time of the receiving of this sacrament is in my soul, and out of my soul; as the Spirit of God is in every godly heart, and out of the heart in heaven with God: so was God, at the creation of man unto His own likeness, in man and out of man. Yet to make it more plain, as the sun in heaven doth extend down his beams and lighten the earth, so doth Christ's body by faith, in spirit, expulse all darkness and sin out of the heart; moveth not bodily, but is everywhere, where faith is, spiritually, and at one time." (Early Writings, P. S. Edit., pp. 190—192.)

III.

"And unto the Holy Supper of the Lord they attribute a distribution, deliverance, or exhibition of Christ's natural body; whereas it is but a confirmation of the grace and

mercy, that He bought for us upon the cross with shedding His precious blood, and death of His innocent body: as the words sheweth plainly, (Luke xxii.; 1 Cor. xi.); where Christ saith, He did not institute His last Supper that men should *bodily eat His body*, but that they should do always the same *in the remembrance of His death, and consider the grace that He obtained for us in His body and blood*, and be thankful for the same." (Ibid, p. 399.)

IV.

"Verba autem mutationis panis et vini ac præsentiæ corporis Christi in cœna Domini, imo verbum sacrificandi et sacrificii, scimus frequenter esse apud patres. Sed ipsi hæc vocabula usurpant eo modo et sensu quo ecclesia Christi ab ejus ascensione usurpavit, et nos nunc usurpamus: hoc est, panem et vinum in sacra cœna mutari quidem, sed in usu, non in substantia; Christum vero corpore suo adesse, sed spiritualiter et sacramentaliter contemplatione fidei recte utentium sacra cœna Domini, quoad corporis ejus gratiam, sed non quoad corporis ejus substantiam. Cœna Domini (quod impia missa non est) etiam sacrificium Christianorum vocatur, non re ipsa, sed nominis communicatione et participatione; quia recordatio et memoria sit veri sacrificii Christi semel in cruce oblati. Qualis autem injuria et tyrannis est hæc, non permittere ut sancti patres sua ipsorum verba interpretentur!" (Later Writings, p. 394.)

V.

"Nos igitur perspicuitatem et lucem verbi divini asse-

quentes Christum (*quod ad carnem ejus attinet*) mundum RELIQUISSE docemus et credimus; Spiritu tamen suo tam bonos quam malos sustentare; hos quidem, ut pie vivant; illos autem, ut impie vivere desistant. Et in sacra actione cœnæ suæ mysticæ PIIS ita semper *adest*, ut illis *seipsum totum tum corpore tum anima communicet;* non ut in CORPUS PER OS *descendat*, sed ut *in animam* PER FIDEM sese infundat, ejusque vi et virtute cum corpus tum anima pie recipientis sacramentum sanctificentur ad vitam æternam; modo non secundum carnem, sed secundum Spiritum, qui se Christo sacramentis obstrinxere vivant et ambulent." (Ibid, p. 453.)

VI.

"Si quis cupit hâc de re plura cognoscere, *quod* MALI NON COMEDANT *corpus Christi*, legat Cyprianum in Sermone De Cœna Domini, Augustinum De verbis Domini, Sermone xxxiii, tractatu in Joannem xxvi, Hieronymum in Esaiam cap. lxvi., libro iv., in Hieremiam, cap. xxii. Et dicere etiam quod canes et mures, si externum signum sacramenti acceperint, quod una cum externo signo significatum (hoc est, corpus et sanguinem Christi,) recipiant (ut dixi,) plane impium est. Panis angelorum factus est munificentia Dei panis et cibus *piorum hominum*, sed *non impiorum*, nec canum nec murum: nec a Deo Patre in mundum Christus erat missus, ut impios, canes, et mures pasceret; sed ut peccatores ad pœnitentiam converteret, et pœnitentes corporis et sanguinis sui meritis adimpleret. Quod autem neoterici dicunt, quod *impii cum sacris signis corporis et*

sanguinis Christi signata (*hoc est, ipsum corpus et sanguinem Christi,*) *accipiant,* sed indigne, et ad judicium et condemnationem, NON ADMITTIMUS; propterea quod de suo scrinio et pectore loquuntur, et *non ex verbo Dei.* Paulus enim clare testatur, quod qui panem signum indigne accipiunt judicium manducent. Hæc sunt illius verba: 'Itaque quisquis ederit panem hunc, aut biberit de poculo Domini, indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini.' Non dicit Paulus, Itaque quisquis ederit *corpus Domini* et biberit *sanguinem Domini indigne:* sed quia *indigne sumentes sacramenta* corporis et sanguinis Christi signis cælestibus contumeliam faciunt, ea contumelia signorum rebus signatis imputatur, ut Paulus dicit; ita ut sint corporis et sanguinis Christi rei: ut Israelitarum, Judæ, ac Simonis Magi exempla testantur; qui externa signa, manna in deserto, sacrum panem in cœna Domini, externamque lotionem baptismatis receperunt, quos tamen Christus non approbavit." (Ibid, pp. 497-8.)

VII.

"The Count Palatine has lately provided for the preaching of the Gospel throughout his dominions; but as far as relates to the Eucharist he has descended, as the proverb has it, from the horse to the ass; for he has fallen from popery into the doctrine of Luther, who is in that particular more erroneous than all the papists; and those who deny the substance of bread to remain in the sacrament, and substitute the body of Christ in its place, come more closely to the truth than those who affirm that the natural Body

of Christ is with the bread, in the bread, and under the form of bread, and yet occupies no place." (Letter to Bullinger in Original Letters, P. S. Edit., i., pp. 37-8.)

Hutchinson.

Roger Hutchinson was educated at Cambridge, where he was admitted fellow of St. John's, 1543. He died a natural death in 1555 or 1556.

The quotations are mostly taken from "The Image of God, or Laymen's Book," first published in 1550, with a dedicatory Epistle to Archbishop Cranmer.

I.

"You will ask me then, whether we receive Christ's body? *Yea, truly*, from heaven, from the right hand of the Father; *not out of the bread, nor in the bread.* For, unless we eat His flesh, and drink His blood, we shall not dwell in Him; we shall not arise at the last day; we shall not have eternal life. Christ's humanity is the mean whereby we must obtain all things; the way by which we must climb up to heaven." (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 35.)

II.

"But peradventure the papists will reply, If it be meat, then is it received both of good and evil men; for neither of both sorts can live without meat. To this I answer, it is the meat of the soul, not of the body; the food of the spirit, not of the flesh; and therefore it is NOT RECEIVED OF EVIL PERSONS, because the *meat is good*, and *they be evil.*

So that this is a strong argument; Christ's flesh and blood is meat; *ergo* it is NOT RECEIVED OF EVIL MEN." (Ibid, p. 42.)

III.

"To eat Christ's flesh and to drink His blood, is *to believe* that the Son of God concerning His humanity and flesh, was *nailed on the Cross, and that His blood was let forth for the expiation of our sins*, and for our redemption and righteousness, and to repose us again into God's favour. And this spiritual receipt, which is *by faith, is so effectual*, and of so mighty and so vehement an operation, that, as matrimony maketh man and wife one flesh according as it is written, *erunt duo in carne una*, so it joineth us unto Christ *reipsa*, that is, *really, truly, and effectually*, making us flesh of His flesh and bones of His bones, as Paul witnesseth; that is, lively, holy, and very members of His mystical body. . . . God's *holy Word knoweth* NO OTHER RECEIPT OF CHRIST'S VERY BODY and natural flesh, neither *in the sacrament nor without it.*" (Ibid, pp. 262, 263.)

IV.

"Throughout the Scriptures this word 'unworthily' is never joined with Christ's body, never with His blood; for *they* do *sanctify* their receivers. St. Austin also denieth this distinction, writing thus: 'He that abideth not in Christ, and in whom Christ abideth not, without doubt he eateth not Christ's flesh nor drinketh not His blood, although he eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing unto His damnation.'" (Ibid, p. 264.)

V.

"And Prosper, in his Book of Sentences, saith of such unworthy receivers, that though every day indifferently they do receive, that they eat the sacrament and figure of so great a thing unto the condemnation of their presumption, and NOT CHRIST'S BODY. Bede also hath the very same words. And the famous and learned father St. Hierome doth confirm this to be a true doctrine, writing upon the sixty-sixth chapter of the prophet Esay, 'As long,' saith this elder and godly father of Christ's Church, 'as long as they be not holy and clean in body and in spirit, they do not eat the flesh of Jesu, nor taste of His blood.' Of these it is evident that, as the sensible sacrament is received unworthily of ungodly men unto condemnation; so THE BODY OF CHRIST, which is the bread of life, IS ONLY RECEIVED WORTHILY and OF GOOD MEN, *always unto salvation*, expiation, and righteousness, and of no man unto destruction, death, and damnation, whosoever is partaker of it; as St. Austin saith in his sermon of the holy feast of passover. Therefore, if we say *that ungodly men do eat Christ's flesh*, we deny the doctrine of all the elder fathers; we deny Christ to be the bread of life; we deny Him to be our righteousness, our saving health, our expiation, our ransom, our sanctification and holiness; who will not fail to deny us likewise before His Father, unless we renounce this devilish error." (Ibid, p. 265.)

VI.

"That the Lord's Supper, which men call the mass, is not a sacrifice for sin, St. Paul declareth plainly, saying:

Sine sanguinis effusione, etc., 'that without shedding of blood no sacrifice can blot out sin.' If Christ be sacrificed or offered in His Supper, for the expiation of sin, His precious and most comfortable blood is shed again, is poured forth again: for without bloodshed is no remission." (Ibid, p. 48.)

VII.

"Wherefore the Supper of the Lord is no *sacrifice* for sin, forasmuch as it is a *sacrament*. Mark this difference, brethren, and be no longer deceived. The parable of the thieves teacheth us, that Christ's coming hath disanulled all such priesthood as is called *sacerdotium;* but *presbyterium* remaineth. The priests and Levites pass by, and leave the wounded man, which was robbed going from Hierusalem to Jericho, unholpen, unprovided for." (Ibid, p. 49.)

VIII.

"Moreover, mark what I say unto thee. Read over all the New Testament, and thou shalt not find once this word, *sacerdos*, 'priest,' applied or spoken of any one sort of ministers (as the common sort do use it), but when it is referred to the Pharisees, and to such as do appertain without all doubt to the Old Testament. It is referred always to all Christian people, which all be *sacerdotes* through Christ: and ministers have *no manner of sacrifice*, but common with the laity, both men and women; that is to say, the *sacrifice of thanksgiving*, and the quick and lively *oblation of their own bodies*. The New Testament requireth *no other sacrifice*." (Ibid, p. 50.)

IX.

"Moreover, as Christ did not ordain His Supper to be received privately for benefactors either dead or alive, or for others, no more did He *elevate* and lift up the sacrament over His head, to be *seen and worshipped* of His disciples. He gave it them into their hands *to eat*, and not *to honour it;* to *receive* it, and *not to worship* it with holding up of their hands and knocks on their breasts. ONLY GOD is to be honoured with this kind of reverence, and NO SACRAMENT; for *God is not a sacrament, neither is the sacrament God.*" (Ibid, 230.)

We have thus had before us extracts from the writings of our Reformers of King Edward's reign.

None, I imagine, who have read these extracts with any degree of care, will hesitate for a moment in acknowledging the distinct and strong repugnance of all the writers to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

In the case of Ridley, indeed, it is, perhaps, scarcely to be wondered at that some of his expressions have been thought to look the other way, and have been eagerly fastened on by those who would fain find shelter for their teaching under so great a name. But other extracts which have been before us leave no room whatever to question what Ridley's views really were. And his own interpretations and explanations of his own expressions afford a good key for the unlocking of difficulties, such as sometimes, perhaps, may be felt in the writings of other Reformers, whose language might otherwise seem to imply either some confusion of mind, or some inconsistency of views.

The truth is that the words "sacrament," "sacramental," "sacramentally," are used in one sense by our Reformers, in quite another sense by our and their opponents.

The word "sacrament" indeed is used by Cranmer and others (as in our Catechism) sometimes as including the inward and spiritual grace, and the whole administration.* But more commonly, in the use of our Reformers, (as again in our Catechism also) it stands for *merely* the outward and visible signs in the Lord's Supper, for the elements of bread and wine.

And since to the sacraments (the visible signs) are given the names of the things they signify (according to the usage of the Fathers), the things signified are said (in the language of our Reformers) to be *sacramentally present* wherever their signs are present and *sacramentally received*, whenever the signs (which bear their names) are received. In such language the words "sacramentally present" or "present in a sacrament," indicate nothing more than the presence of the sacrament or outward sign, and the word "sacramentally received" would tell only of the reception of the visible element. To say that the blood is present in the cup "*sacramentally*," or "*in a sacrament*" or "*by way of a sacrament*," is equivalent to saying that the sacrament of the blood (*i.e.* the wine which signifies Christ's blood) is there. So after Ridley had declared that "the cup *is called the blood* (*i.e.* by Chrysostom) because it is *the sacrament of the blood*," he will not allow Curtop to fasten on that which is in the chalice the name of *blood*, in any other sense (in the sense of "the Real Presence") by distinguishing between the *sacrament* of the blood and the *blood*, but he maintains "The

* See Cranmer's Preface to "The Lord's Supper." Edit. of 1551.

sacrament of the blood *is* the blood, (*i.e.* in the language of Chrysostom) and that is attributed to the sacrament, (*i.e.* of course by Chrysostom) which is spoken of the thing of the sacrament."

Thus it will be seen that the words "sacramental" and "sacramentally" exclude the sense of "real" and "really," and are indeed distinctly opposed to them.* Quite as much

* "Therefore, the bread *is called Christ's body* after consecration, as St. Ambrose saith, and yet it is NOT SO REALLY, but *sacramentally*." (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper." P. S. Edit., p. 180.) "As Christ's body is called bread, although *indeed it be not bread:* so the *sacramental bread* is called Christ's body, although *indeed* it be *not Christ's body* . . . even so, according to the saying of Ignatius, it is the flesh of Christ . . . . that is to say, a *sacrament* of that flesh. . . . Thus they borrow each of them the other's name, because they are joined together in one mystery. . . . If any man think it strange that the sacrament *is called* the body and the flesh of Christ, being *not so indeed*, let him understand that the written word of God is likewise called Christ's body and Christ's flesh. . . So, saith St. Hierome." (Jewel, "Sermon and Harding," pp. 518, 519.) "There be three manner of eatings, one spiritual only, another spiritual and sacramental both together, and the third *sacramental* only: and yet *Christ Himself* is eaten but in the *first two* manner of ways, as you truly teach. And for to set out this distinction somewhat more plainly, that plain men may understand it, it may thus be termed: that there is a spiritual eating only, when Christ by a true faith is eaten without the sacrament; also there is another eating both spiritual and *sacramental*, when the visible *sacrament* is eaten with the mouth, and Christ Himself is eaten with a true faith: the third eating is *sacramentally* only, when *the sacrament is eaten, and not Christ Himself.* So that in the first is Christ eaten without the sacrament; in the second He is eaten with the sacrament; and in the third is the *sacrament* eaten *without Him;* and therefore it is called *sacramental eating* only, because *only the sacrament* is eaten, and *not Christ Himself.*" (Cranmer "On Lord's Supper," p. 205.) This agrees exactly with what Ridley says, "Evil men do eat the very true and natural Body of Christ *sacra-*

as the phrases "representative presence" and "figurative presence" would be inconsistent with *actual* presence, and the phrases "representatively present," and "figuratively present," and "present by representation," and "present in a figure," and "present in a picture," would necessarily imply *actual absence;* quite so much in the language of our

mentally and *no further*." which he explains after, "It is the body to them, that is, the *sacrament of the body*," pp. 246, 247. So Cranmer again, "The evil [eat] ONLY *sacramentally*, that is to say *figuratively*. And therefore hath St. Augustine these words *certo quodam modo* 'after a certain manner,' because that the evil eat the *sacrament*, which after a certain manner is called the very body of Christ." (On Lord's Supper, pp. 224-5.) "Although St. Augustine . . . . call the sacrament of Christ's body and blood His body and blood, yet is the *sacrament* NO MORE but the *sacrament thereof*, and yet it is *called* the body and blood of Christ, as 'sacraments have the names of the things whereof they be sacraments;' as the same St. Augustine teacheth most plainly." (Ibid, p. 224.) Again, "A figure hath the name of the thing that is signified thereby. As a man's image is called a man, a lion's image a lion, etc., etc., . . . so a thousand like speeches . . . not understand of the *very* things, but only of the *images* of them." (Ibid, pp. 225, 226.) "He [Christ] is not in it [the bread], neither spiritually, as He is in man, nor corporally, as He is in heaven, but ONLY *sacramentally*, as a thing may be said to be *in the figure* whereby it is signified." (Ibid, p. 238.) "It is the same body which was born of the Virgin, was crucified, ascended; but *tropically*, and by *a figure*. And so I say *Panis est corpus*, is a figurative speech, speaking *sacramentally;* for it is a sacrament of His body." (Cranmer's Disputation at Oxford, P. S. Edit., p. 400, 401.) "All these things do convince their error, which interpret *sacramental* speeches as *proper*, and reject figures and tropes, especially in the institution of the Supper." (Bullinger's Decades, v., p. 40, 289.) "Undoubtedly their meaning is, that we should speak of the sacraments sacramentally, and that *sacramental* speeches ought to be expounded *sacramentally*." (Ibid, p. 451.) "If thou yet marvel, how the unbelievers can be guilty of the Lord's body and blood, being eaten but *sacramentally*; learn this out of other places." (Ibid, p.

Reformers (who in this matter, believed at least, that they were following the example of the ancient Fathers) would the phrases "sacramental presence," "sacramentally present," "present in a sacrament," "present by way of a sacrament," "symbolically present," "present in mystery," and the like, necessarily EXCLUDE *the* REAL *presence* of the things signified by the present sacraments or outward signs. This is the more carefully to be observed, because in the language of the Church of Rome, as well as in that of those who now maintain the doctrine of "the Real Objective Presence," the words "sacramental" and "sacramentally," include the idea of intense *reality** of Presence, however

466.) "They understood, that the Lord's bread, given unto them by the Lord, is a *remembrance* of His body . . . for all *sacramental* speeches were to the holy fathers very well known." (Ibid, p. 442.) "Augustin doth not feign, that Christ hath two bodies; but he meaneth, that the human body bare in his hands the *sacramental* body, that is to say, the bread which is in the *sacrament* of the true body." (Ibid, p. 438.) "It is a *sacramental* speech, which truly everybody at that time understood; as also at this day it is no new nor hard kind of speaking to say, that in the seal there is faith and truth, in a marriage-ring the faith and love of wedlock, in a sceptre and crown the king's authority." (Ibid, p. 310.) So Jeremy Taylor, "St. Austin opposes *sacramental* receiving to the *true* and *real*, and says that the wicked only receive it *sacramentally* but not the thing whose sacrament it is." (Vol. vi., p. 72.) It should be added, to avoid misunderstanding, that in this "*unreal*" signification of the words "sacramental," "sacramentally," and the like (as applied to the *presence*, etc., of the *thing signified*) there is nothing to imply any denial or forgetfulness of the *real* relation which the "*sign* or *sacrament*" bears to "*so great a thing*" as it not only signifies but *seals*, and sealing is the *real* communion of, by virtue of Christ's institution making the "*sacramentum*" to be "by grace," to all INTENTS AND PURPOSES, the "*res sacramenti*" to the FAITHFUL.

* "We say that the union is *sacramental;* not as if we meant by that term to signify, that it is, in any respect, less than, or different

that Presence may be regarded as supernatural and ineffable. And thus if the distinction of meanings be not carefully observed, we may be apt to fall into great confusion, and may easily be led to play with quotations at cross purposes.*

from reality. By *sacramental* we mean that it is unique, a union proper and peculiar to the sacrament, without example and without parallel, except in the great fact of the Incarnation." (Tracts for the Day, v., p. 32.) "The Presence, of which our Lord speaks, has been termed sacramental, supernatural, mystical, ineffable, as opposed *not* to what is real, but to what is natural." (Pusey's Sermon "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," p. 21, compare Council of Trent, Sess. xiii., ch. i., and see Goode on Eucharist, i., p. 160-1, and Supple. 19, 20.)

* In no other way is it possible (I think) to account for such a use of the authority of our Reformers and of the words of Ridley as the following: "It is well to remember that the leading English Reformers did not deny the *Reality* of our Lord's Presence in the Holy Eucharist, but only contended that this Presence was supernatural *and sacramental.* Thus Ridley, when examined at Oxford as to his faith, six months before he was put to death, says, 'It is His True Blood which is in the Chalice, I grant, and the same which sprang from the side of Christ . . . . but *by way of a Sacrament.*'" (Mackonochie's Address, Jan. 1867, p. 5.) In no other way, also, does it seem possible to account for Mr. Grueber's marginal notes to his citations from Ridley in "Reply to Dr. Heurtley," p. 6, 7.

The next paper will be taken up with extracts from our Reforming Divines of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

PAPERS ON THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE

No. III.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS:

REFORMING DIVINES OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

In this Paper no attempt is made to classify the writers. It contains extracts from the writings of our Reforming Divines in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, their names following one another in alphabetical order.

Becon.

Thomas Becon, born 1511 or 1512, was educated at Cambridge, where he was a diligent hearer of Latimer. He was ordained about 1538. Under the act of the Six Articles, "he was compelled, besides suffering, it would seem, some imprisonment, to make a public submission." On the accession of Edward, he became rector of St. Stephen, Walbrook, and was made by Cranmer one of the six preachers of Canterbury Cathedral. Subsequently he became chaplain to the Duke of Somerset. On Mary's accession he was committed to the Tower as a seditious preacher, with Bradford and Veron. Being released he retired to Strasburgh. On the death of Mary he returned to England, and in the Convocation of 1562 voted in favour of the six propositions for the omission of some ceremonies. The propositions were rejected by a majority of one. He was a friend of Archbishop Parker, and sincerely attached to the Church of England. He died about 1570.

The following extracts are taken from "The Catechism set forth dialogue-wise in familiar talk between the father and the son."

It has a Preface addressed to Becon's children, concluding thus, "Take it, therefore, with joyful hearts, as a testimony of your father's goodwill toward you; yea, receive it as your patrimony . . . . And I shall most humbly beseech God to be your father and defender, and to give you His Holy Spirit, which may govern you in all your doings, that ye may walk blameless in His sight, and be found in the number of God's elect."

I.

Father:—"Why, is not the very natural body of Christ eaten of the communicants both faithful and unfaithful at the Lord's Supper?"

Son:—"Christ is ONLY *received and eaten of the* FAITHFUL *communicants;* the unfaithful *receive* NOT *the Body and Blood of Christ*, but the *sacraments of the same* ONLY, yea, and that unto their damnation."

Father:—"And is Christ received *corporally* with the *corporal mouth* of the faithful communicants?"

Son:—"The natural Body of Christ is *only in heaven;* and, notwithstanding, the soul of the faithful communicant with her mouth, that is to say, *with* FAITH, doth truly and unfeignedly feed upon it unto her great joy and comfort, and feeleth no less true refection than the body doth by receiving corporal food; yea, the faithful communicant, thus eating and receiving Christ, receiveth both in body and soul an heavenly nourishment, a singular comfort, and an unoutspeakable joy."

Father:—"Faith then is the mouth of the soul, wherewith Christ is received and eaten."

Son:—"Yea, verily, as Christ saith: 'I am that bread

of life. He that cometh unto me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.'" (Catechism, etc., P. S. Edit., p. 295.)

II.

Father:—"What shall we then say to the ancient Fathers of Christ's Church, which in many places call the Supper of the Lord a sacrifice?"

Son:—"'Even as images are wont to be called, (as St. Austin saith,) by the names of those things whereof they are images, as when we behold a table or wall painted we say, that is Cicero, that is Sallustius;' so likewise, forasmuch as the celebration of the Lord's Supper is a certain representative image of the passion of Christ, which is the alone true sacrifice, therefore, the holy Fathers many times call the Lord's Supper a sacrifice. Now, if the Lord's Supper be *not properly a sacrifice,* but only a *memorial of the true sacrifice,* which is the passion and death of Christ; how can the massing papists brag that their Mass (in the which many things are done contrary to the institution of Christ) is a propitiatory, satisfactory, and expiatory sacrifice for the sins of quick and of the dead?" (Ibid, p. 249.)

III.

Son:—"Our Saviour Christ did both institute this holy Supper at a table, and the apostles of Christ also did receive it at a table. And what can be more perfect than that which Christ and his apostles have done? All the primitive Church also received the Supper of the Lord at a table. And St. Paul, speaking of the Lord's Supper, maketh

mention not of an altar, but of a table, 'Ye cannot be partakers,' saith he, 'of the Lord's table, and of the devil's table also.' Tables for the ministration of the Lord's Supper continued in the Church of Christ almost three hundred years after Christ universally, and in some places longer, as histories make mention; so that the use of altars is but a new invention, and brought in, as some write, by Pope Sixtus, the second of that name.

"Moreover, an altar hath relation to a sacrifice. And altars in the old law were built and set up at the commandment of God to offer sacrifice upon them. But *all those sacrifices do now cease*, (for they were but shadows of good things to come,) therefore the *altars ought to cease* with them. Christ alone is our altar, our sacrifice, and our priest. Our altar is in heaven. Our altar is not made of stone, but of flesh and blood; of whom the apostle writeth thus: 'We have an altar, whereof it is not lawful for them to eat which serve in the tabernacle.'" (Ibid, p. 297.)

IV.

"Of these words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ it is manifest, plain, and evident, that the virtue and power of His flesh and blood is so great and mighty, that whosoever eateth and drinketh thereof shall live for ever, and have everlasting life. But the wicked and *unfaithful*, although they eat the sacramental bread and drink the sacramental wine, have not everlasting life, as we have Judas for an example: therefore it followeth, that *the wicked and* UNFAITHFUL *do* NOT *eat nor drink the body and blood of Christ.*

"Again Christ saith: 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' But the wicked and unfaithful dwell not in Christ, nor Christ in them; therefore the *wicked and* UNFAITHFUL *neither eat nor drink the body and blood of Christ*, although they daily receive the *sacraments* and *signs* of them, as St. Augustine saith." (Ibid, p. 292.)

V.

"THIS IS *to eat that bread of life*, even to *believe in Christ*, that is to say, by love to be incorporate in Him. Therefore, forasmuch as the reprobate hath not believed in Him, he *hath not eaten Him;* and so he had not the faith of the Christians, whereby alone sins are released."

Father.—"These words are very plain, and cannot justly be denied; of the which we learn truly, that *not the* UNFAITHFUL, but the faithful, *not the wicked*, but the godly disposed *only, eat and drink of the body and blood of Christ*. Notwithstanding, I would also in this behalf gladly hear the judgment of the ancient Fathers and old writers, that we may be well assured, even by their testimonies also, that this is no new doctrine, to teach that the godly only eat Christ, and not the wicked; the faithful, and not the unfaithful; the members of Christ, and not the members of Satan." (Ibid, p. 292.)

VI.

"All these testimonies of the ancient writers, diligently

considered, declare manifestly that NOT *wicked and* UNFAITHFUL, but the godly and *faithful* persons *only* eat the body and drink the blood of Christ. The ungodly eat the sacrament; but they eat not Christ, which is signified by the sacrament, as St. Augustine writeth of Judas: 'The apostles,' saith he, 'did eat bread, that was the Lord; but Judas did eat but the bread of the Lord, and not the bread that was the Lord.' For whosoever eateth Christ liveth for ever, dwelleth in Christ and Christ in him, is incorporated and made all one with Christ, is made a member of Christ's body, is sanctified and made holy, is made clean both in body and soul, dieth not the death of a sinner, hath remission of his sins, obtaineth immortality, escheweth all evils of death, and for ever liveth with Christ. But none of all these things chance to the unfaithful and wicked persons; therefore eat they not the body of Christ, nor yet drink His blood." (Ibid, p. 294.)

VII.

"Finally, who knoweth not that we come unto the Lord's table, not to offer bloody sacrifices, to the performance whereof we had need of altars, but to eat and drink and spiritually to feed upon Him that was once crucified and offered up for us on the altar of the cross, a sweet-smelling sacrifice to God the Father, yea, and that once for all? Now if we come together to eat and drink these holy mysteries, and so spiritually to eat Christ's body, and to drink His blood, unto salvation both of our bodies and souls,

who seeth not that a table is more meet for the celebration of the Lord's Supper than an altar?" (Ibid, p. 298.)

VIII.

"He said not, Behold, fall down and worship. The worshipping therefore of the sacrament ought utterly to be forbidden and to be abolished, as mere idolatry and most execrable abomination before the Lord our God, to whom alone all worship, honour, and glory is due." (Ibid, p. 301.)

Bilson.

One of the most eminent and learned prelates of Elizabeth's reign was Thomas Bilson, born 1536; Bishop of Worcester, 1596; Bishop of Winchester, 1597 to 1616, who, among various other learned works, published in 1585, when he was Warden of Winchester, one entitled, "The True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion," to which was added a Dedicatory Epistle to the Queen.

From this work (one sentence of which has been frequently quoted to prove that Bishop Bilson maintained the objective view of the Presence—See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 789), the following extracts are made. He took a prominent part in the Hampton Court Conference. Died 1616.

I.

"But the wicked, notwithstanding the corporal chamming of this sacrament, die the death of sinners; *ergo, they neither eat the flesh of Christ, nor drink His blood;* not because their teeth or jaws fail them, but by reason they want faith, which is *the right and proper instrument of spiritual eating.*

"Since, then, man 'believeth with his heart unto righteousness' (Romans x.,) as Paul teacheth, not with his jaws

nor lips; *ergo, the soul of man which* ONLY *believeth,* ONLY *doth eat the flesh of Christ;* and our bodies, which have no means to believe, can neither eat nor drink in that sort and sense that our Saviour there speaketh of.

"*The wicked live not by Christ, neither abide in Christ, and therefore by the very determination of the Lord Himself, they neither eat His flesh, nor drink His blood.* Run now to your distinction of corporal and spiritual eating when you will, but so long as these words stand written in the Gospel, 'He that eateth me, even he shall live by me,' the godly will soon conclude, THAT SUCH AS LIVE NOT BY CHRIST, DO NOT EAT CHRIST: [his own capitals:] and so that corporal eating of Christ's flesh, which you would erect, common to the faithful and faithless, to be no kind of eating at all, notwithstanding they receive the material and external elements of this mystery." (Quoted in Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 790.)

II.

"The sacraments are carnally pressed with teeth, which they [*i.e.*, the wicked] are partakers of as well as the godly; but *Christ Himself is not eaten with teeth;* and therefore *the wicked, wanting both spirit and faith by which He is received, cannot possibly eat His flesh, or drink His blood, though they come to His table never so often.*" (Ibid, p. 791.)

III.

"The signs which are called after consecration by the names Christ's body and blood, do enter our mouths, and

pass our throats; the true flesh and blood of Christ do not, but are eaten at the Lord's table only of the inward man by faithful devotion and affection, preparing the heart that Christ may lodge there, and dwell there, where He delighteth, and not in the mouths and jaws of men, which is no place for Him THAT SITTETH IN HEAVEN, WHITHER WE MUST FLY WITH THE SPIRITUAL WINGS OF OUR SOULS AND SPIRITS BEFORE WE CAN BE PARTAKERS OF HIM." (Ibid, p. 791.)

IV.

"I trust the godly will be fully resolved, that the manner of eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood, which the Lord Himself first proposed in the sixth of John, was *not literal nor corporal*, as the Capernites understand Him and were deceived, but *allegorical and spiritual*. *Allegorical* in respect of the words which be not there precisely taken in their usual signification for grinding with the teeth, and straining down the throat, but *figuratively spoken*, and import as much as *confessing and embracing with heart and inward affection*. *Spiritual*, because not our mouths, but our minds—not our bellies, but our spirits, are nourished with the flesh and blood of Christ, and that not by chewing or swallowing, but BY REMEMBERING AND BELIEVING THAT HIS BODY WAS WOUNDED, AND HIS BLOOD SHED FOR OUR PERFECT AND ETERNAL REDEMPTION." (Ibid, p. 795.)

V.

"As we doubt not that Christ is always present on His table in *truth, grace, virtue, and effect, if we open the eyes of*

our faith to behold Him, and mouth of our spirits to receive Him, so the local and corporal hiding of His human substance under the shews of bread and wine was never taught by any Catholic Father or Council." (Ibid, p. 801.)

VI.

"By these things we have Him in this world, NOT REALLY, locally, or corporally, but truly, comfortably, and effectually, so as our bodies, souls, and spirits be sanctified and preserved by Him against the day of redemption." (Ibid, p. 800.)

VII.

"[The Fathers] taught Christ to be present *not in flesh but in grace; not in real and corporal existence, but in spiritual and fruitful efficience.* They prepared for Him not their jaws and bellies, but their minds and hearts." (Ibid, pp. 801, 802.)

VIII.

"*For as that part of man, which eateth the flesh of Christ, everteth your real presence,* because no local or corporal substance can enter or feed the soul, and the truth of Christ's flesh in this mystery by the general consent of all ages and churches doth enter and feed the soul; so THE PLACE WHITHER WE MUST ASCEND BEFORE WE CAN EAT THE LORD'S FLESH DOTH CLEARLY CONFUTE THE SAME." (Ibid, p. 802.)

IX.

"Your *Real Presence* and ubiquity, if you will have Christ's human substance dispersed in many places, *without*

shape or circumscription, are THE VERY BOWELS AND INWARDS OF EUTYCHES' HERESY." (Ibid, p. 803.)

X.

Phi, (Romanist) :—"I see you mistake us. You think we adore the forms of bread and wine, when indeed we do not, but rather we adore Christ the Son the living God, and second Person in the Trinity in those mysteries, as St. Ambrose saith, or *as we speak more usually, under those forms of bread and wine.*"

Theo :—"I mistake you not. I know you adore that which is locally and really *enclosed within the compass of your host and chalice, supposing it in matter and substance to be the glorious body of Christ;* but your foundation we say is false, and therefore your building must needs be ruinous. Christ is present in the mysteries, not by the material substance of His body *closed within the forms of bread and wine*, but *by a divine and spiritual virtue and efficience*, NOT MIXING HIS SUBSTANCE WITH THE ELEMENTS, BUT ENTERING THE HEARTS OF THE FAITHFUL, and nourishing them with His spirit and grace to eternal life, the elements abiding in their proper and former essence and substance." (Ibid, pp. 805, 6.)

XI.

"Neither they nor I ever denied the Eucharist to be a *sacrifice*. The very name enforceth it to be the sacrifice of *praise* and *thanksgiving;* which is the *true* and *lively* sacrifice of the New Testament. The Lord's table, in respect of His *graces* and *mercies* there proposed to us, is an heavenly banquet, which we must *eat*, and not sacrifice : but the *duties*

which He requireth at our hands, when we approach His table, are *sacrifices*, not *sacraments*. As namely, to *offer* Him *thanks* and *praises*, *faith* and *obedience*, yea our *bodies* and *souls*, to be living, holy, and acceptable *sacrifices* unto Him, which is our *reasonable* service." (Quoted from Waterland, Works, v., p. 134.)

Calfhill.

James Calfhill, or Calfield, born about 1530, educated at Oxford, was nominated to succeed Sandys as Bishop of Worcester, when Sandys was removed to London; but he died before his consecration.

The following extract is taken from Calfhill's answer to John Martial, who had dedicated to Queen Elizabeth a Romish work, entitled, "A Treatise of the Cross."

"But where I attribute to Christian ministry so much as I spake of, there is no cause of pride for popish priests. For they swerve so far from Christ's institution, that they serve not at all for any godly purpose. Christ did ordain His apostles to preach; and to that end He breathed on them, shewing, by that sign, the power and virtue of the Holy Ghost, wherewithal He endued them: but the Romish apes only retain the sign, the thing itself being farthest from them; and as for the end which Christ respected, they have least regard of. For they have taught their priests, that it is least part of their duty to preach; most to do sacrifice, and say Mass. . . . We know that Christ did offer Himself sufficiently; and made a perfect satisfaction for our sins. We know that He needeth not any priest's help to be as acceptable to His Father, for His service sake, as Christ for that one and only sacrifice of His body was.

Christ gave commandment to be faithful ministers, not bloody conjurors. Christ gave an injunction to feed the flock, not to offer sacrifice. Christ hath promised His Holy Ghost, not to purge and take away sins, but to maintain the church, and keep it in good order. And as for the argument, that the most learned papists do build upon the Greek word, may easily be answered. For Chrysostom, when he had considered how Paul had written, that he was a minister of Jesus Christ, consecrating the Gospel; (for so St. Augustine turneth it,) that there might be an acceptable oblation and sacrifice of the Gentiles, saith: that the apostle there did make full mention of all the sacrifice that he could make; using both the terms of λειτουργία and ἱερουργία, whereupon the papists will ground their idolatrous Mass. This is my sacrifice, to preach the Gospel, saith he: my sword is the Gospel; my sacrifice is the Gentiles." (Answer to Martiall, P. S. Edit., pp. 229, 230.)

Cooper.

Thomas Cooper, or Cowper, was made Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1540. In Mary's reign he practised as a physician in Oxford, but upon her death became a frequent preacher, and was several years Vice-chancellor of the University. In 1570 he was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln; and in 1584 was translated to Winchester. He died April 29th, 1594.

The following quotations are taken from a publication entitled, "An Answer in Defence of the Faith." It was written (1562) by Cooper in reply to an anonymous work, called "An Apology of Private Mass."

I.

"When we interpret Christ's words, we say it is a figurative speech, and such as the Holy Ghost often useth in the institution of sacraments and ceremonies, or in the describing of other mysteries. The figure is named Metonymia; when the name of the thing is given unto the sign. When these words therefore be laid unto us, 'This is My Body," we say it is most true. But mystically, *sacramentally*, figuratively, *not* REALLY and according to the natural substance. For this interpretation we have a number of examples out of the Canonical Scriptures." ("Defence of the Truth," P. S. Edit., p. 199.)

II.

"For, sure I am, that neither the institution of Christ maketh mention of any oblation or sacrifice to be done by the minister, saving only the sacrifice of thanksgiving: nor yet the Scripture appointeth any bounden duty for the priest more to use the sacrament than other godly and well-disposed Christian men. . . . . A sacrifice is a thing given to God: the sacrament was a thing given to us. Nothing therefore can be of nature more contrary than your sacrifice, and Christ's sacrament." (Ibid, pp. 87, 88.)

III.

"So much difference therefore as is between to give and to receive; to REMEMBER ONE *perfect sacrifice*, and daily to REITERATE a *sacrifice;* to celebrate in common as a testimony of unity, (and) to creep in corners or by-chapels as a sign of separation; so much difference is there between the *sacrament* by Christ's appointment, and the *sacrifice* of the Mass by you devised." (Ibid, p. 99.)

Coverdale.

Miles Coverdale, born 1487, studied at Cambridge, entered the Augustinian order, aided Tyndale in the translation of the Bible, and by permission of Henry VIII., published his own translation in 1535. It was the first printed English Bible. Three years after, while at Paris preparing for another edition, he was cited before the Inquisition, and the copies printed were condemned to be burnt. He returned to England, was made almoner to Queen Catharine Parr, and in 1551 Bishop of Exeter. In Queen Mary's reign he reached Geneva, contributing his aid to the Geneva Bible. He returned after Mary's death, and held for a short time a rectory in London. He died 1568.

The First extract is from a treatise, the plan of which was borrowed from Zuingle. It is said to have been first published at Marpurg in 1540—47.

I.

"But *then eat we His flesh*, and *then drink we His blood*, when we through *true belief* do ponder and consider what He hath done and suffered for our sakes; *then are we partakers of His Supper and Feast*, when we for His sake do live, as He did for His Father's sake." ("Fruitful Lessons," P. S. Edit., p. 212.)

II.

"But let us look, wherefore they call it a sacrifice. Even because, say they, that in the Mass Christ the Son is offered up unto God His Father. Oh, what a great blasphemy is this; yea, to be abhorred of all virtuous men! . . . . . But they will say, Christ is not so sacrificed in the Mass, that He dieth again upon the Cross; but it is for the remembrance of the same sacrifice that once was made. Why do they then call it a *sacrifice*, seeing it is but a *remembrance of a sacrifice?*" (Remains, pp. 470, 471.)

III.

"And when this perverse opinion was once received, it engendered many other superstitions. First, that carnal adoration, which is none other thing but mere idolatry. For if a man would prostrate himself before the bread, and honour Christ there, as if He were there present, contained therein, were not that the setting up of an idol instead of the sacrament? For we were not commanded to honour, but to eat."* ("Fruitful Lessons," p. 456.)

Fulke.

William Fulke born sometime before 1538. Educated at Cambridge, studied law for six years, was elected fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, 1564, was subsequently ejected on account of his intimacy with Cartwright. In 1571, he was presented to the rectory of Warley in Essex, and in 1573 to that of Dennington in Suffolk. Afterwards he accompanied the Earl of Lincoln as British Ambassador to Paris. In 1578 was made Master of Pembroke College. He died in 1589.

The first four extracts are taken from a work published in 1583, in defence "of the sincere and true translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English tongue."

I.

"The word *priest*, by Popish abuse, is commonly taken for a sacrificer, the same that *sacerdos* in Latin. But the Holy Ghost never calleth the ministers of the word and sacraments of the New Testament ἱερεῖς or *sacerdotes*. Therefore the translators, to make a difference between the ministers of the Old Testament and them of the New, calleth the one, according to the usual acception, priests, and

* This extract is from a treatise translated by Coverdale from Calvin.

the other, according to the original derivation, elders. Which distinction seeing the vulgar Latin text doth always rightly observe, it is in favour of your heretical sacrificing priesthood, that you corruptly translate *sarcerdos* and *presbyter* always, as though they were all one, *a priest*, as though the Holy Ghost had made that distinction in vain, or that there were no difference between the priesthood of the New Testament and the Old. The name of priest, according to the original derivation from *presbyter*, we do not refuse: but according to the common acception for a *sacrificer*, we cannot take it, when it is spoken of the ministry of the New Testament." ("Defence of Translation," P. S. Edit. p. 109.)

II.

"In denying the blasphemous sacrifice of the popish mass, with the altar and priesthood that thereto belongeth, we use no wily policy, but with open mouth at all times, and in all places, we cry out upon it. The sacrifices, priests, and altars of the Gentiles were abominable.

The sacrifices of the Jews, their priests, and altars, are all accomplished and finished in the only sacrifice of Christ, our High Priest, offered once for all upon the altar of the cross: which Christ our Saviour, seeing He is a High Priest according to the order of Melchisedec, hath an eternal priesthood, and such as passeth not by succession. (Heb vii.) Therefore *did* NOT Christ at His last supper institute *any* EXTERNAL *propitiatory sacrifice* of His body and blood, but a *sacrament*, joined with the *spiritual sacrifice* of praise

and thanksgiving: which sacrament being administered by the ministers thereto appointed, the sacrifice is so common to the whole Church of the faithful, who are all spiritual priests, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, as much as the minister of the word and sacraments." (Ibid, p. 241.)

III.

"Beza saith expressly in this place, (1 Cor. x.) that to bless here is to sanctify or consecrate, because that the ordinance of God being rehearsed and set forth, the bread and wine are appointed to this holy use, that they should be the *sacraments of* the true and natural body and blood of Christ, that is, the *signs and pledges thereof*, and that in such sort, that the same thing which is signified is *offered to us* to be *received spiritually*." (Ibid, pp. 501, 502.)

IV.

"Master Whitaker is not so young a divine, but he knoweth that Chrysostom speaketh of the ineffable manner of Christ's presence spiritually, though He be absent corporally: as in the place by you cited, *de sacerdotio*, it is most manifest, where he saith that we may 'see the people dyed and made red with the precious blood of Christ;' which as it is not with the eye of the body, but with the eye of faith, so is Christ that is *corporally present* in heaven, *spiritually present unto* THE FAITH *of the worthy receiver* . . . 'It is a famous place' indeed, that never a one of the ancient writers could consider for any real presence to be drawn out of it." (Ibid, p. 510, 511.)

V.

"Here is *no* SACRIFICE of *the body and blood of Christ*, but of *bread and wine for the mystery thereof;* no SACRIFICE *propitiatory for sins, but of thanksgiving*, and REMEMBRANCE *of the propitiation* made by the Lamb Himself, in hope of eternal redemption; no oblation by the priest only, but by the whole Church and every member thereof, as was the oblation of the Paschal Lamb, whereunto he compareth this sacrifice, interpreting those words of Exodus xii.: 'Every man shall take a lamb according to their families and households, and offer him in sacrifice at the evening.' That is to say, (saith Ceolfride,) all Christian Churches, etc., as before. By which words it is manifest, that the Papists now-a-days are departed even from that faith of the sacrament and sacrifice thereof that Augustin brought from Rome." (Answers, P. S. Edit., p. 8.)

VI.

"The Church of English Saxons believed the sacrament to be the body and blood of Christ, not carnally, but spiritually; expressly denying as well the CARNAL PRESENCE as *Transubstantiation*, which the Papists hold." (Ælf. Serm. Pasc. and Ep., Ibid, p. 20.)

VII.

"In the English Saxon Church the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not then hanged up to be worshipped, nor carried in procession, because they had not the opinion of CARNAL PRESENCE which the Papists have," etc. "The English Saxons' Church DENIED *that* WICKED *men received*

the body and blood of Christ." (Ælf. Serm. Pasc.) "The Papists hold that not only wicked men, but also brute beasts eat the body of Christ, if they eat the external *sacrament thereof.*" (Ibid, p. 21.)

VIII.

"The calf that was killed was by God's appointment a sacrifice of the only and singular Sacrifice of Christ's death, and not by virtue of the signification; for the Jews had other ceremonies than sacrifices, which did signify the death of Christ: but the Lord's Supper is *not* by God's appointment a SACRIFICE; therefore the signification cannot make it so." (Ibid, p. 382.)

JEWEL.

Neal says of John Jewel, "He was born in Devonshire, 1522, and educated at Christ Church College, Oxon, where he proceeded M.A. 1544. In King Edward's reign he was a zealous promoter of the Reformation, but not having the courage of a martyr, he yielded to some things against his conscience in the reign of Queen Mary, for which he asked the pardon of God and the Church, among the exiles in Germany, where he continued a confessor of the Gospel till Queen Elizabeth's accession, when he returned home, and was preferred to the bishopric of Salisbury, in 1559. . . . . He was a truly pious man, and died in a comfortable frame of mind. Some of his last words were, 'I have not so lived that I am ashamed to die; neither am I afraid to die, for we have a gracious Lord. There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness. Christ is my righteousness. Lord, let thy servant depart in peace,' which he did at Mockton-Farley, September 25, 1571, in the fiftieth year of his age, and lies buried in the middle of the choir of the Cathedral of Salisbury." (History of the Puritans, i., p. 183.)

Jewel's powerful voice made itself so clearly heard, not in England only, but on the Continent;* he was so much

* See Strype's Parker, Book iv., Chap. v., p. 317, and Strype's Annals, Vol. i., Chap. xxv., pp. 284—288. Also Heylin's History of Reformation, E. H. S. Edit., Vol. ii., p. 328—330, 385—387.

regarded as the spokesman of the Reformed Church of England, the influence he exercised under Elizabeth was so great, moreover he has been so referred to in support of the arguments by which the "Real Objective Presence" has been defended, that we must occupy some space in extracts from his writings.

I.

"To conclude, Three things herein we must consider:— First, that we put a difference between the sign and the thing itself that is signified.

"Secondly, That we seek Christ above in heaven, and imagine *not Him to be present bodily upon the earth.*

"Thirdly, *That the body of Christ is to be eaten by* FAITH ONLY, and NONE OTHERWISE." (Sermon and Harding, P.S. Edit., p. 449.)

II.

"Now consider thou, good Christian reader, with thyself, whether it be better to use this word '*figure*,' which word hath been often used of Tertullian, St. Augustine, and of all the rest of the ancient Fathers, without controlment; or else those new fangled words, 'really,' 'corporally,' 'carnally,' etc. Which words M. Harding is not able to show that, in this case of being REALLY IN the sacrament, any one of all the old Fathers ever used." (Ibid, p. 49.)

III.

"Cyrillus saith: Our sacrament teacheth us not to eat a man (with the material *mouth of our body*,) in ungodly sort leading the minds of the faithful unto gross cogitation.

It is a holy mystery, and a heavenly action, forcing our minds up into heaven, and there teaching us to eat the body of Christ, and to drink His blood; not outwardly by the service of our bodies, but *inwardly* by *our* FAITH, and that verily and indeed. The truth hereof standeth not in any REAL *or* CORPORAL PRESENCE, but, as Hilarius saith, in a *mystery*, which is, in a *sacrament:* whereby outwardly and unto our senses we express that thing in our bodies that must be wrought inwardly in our minds.'" (Ibid, pp. 475, 476.)

IV.

"Like as the body or compass of the sun, being in one certain place of the heavens, reacheth out his beams and giveth influence into the world; even so Christ, the Sun of Justice, being in heaven in one place at the right hand of God, likewise reacheth out His beams, and giveth His influence into the faithful, and so feedeth them, not by bare imagination of fantasy, but *truly*, *substantially*, and *indeed*. And as the sun is more comfortable, and more refresheth the world, being absent, by his beams, than if his very natural substance and compass lay here upon the earth; even so the body of Christ, being in the glory of the Father, in the very substance and nature of the flesh, and there evermore entreating mercy for our sins, is much more comfortable unto us, and more quickeneth both our bodies and souls by His heavenly and spiritual influence, than if it were here present fleshly before our eyes. And as the sun, not coming down from heaven, nor leaving his place,

is nevertheless present with us in our houses, in our faces, in our hands, and in our bosoms; even so Christ, being in heaven, not coming down, nor leaving His room there, yet nevertheless is present with us in our congregations, in our hearts, in our prayers, in the mystery of baptism, and in the sacrament of His body and blood." (Ibid, p. 499.)

v.

"And where he saith, the sacraments of the New Testament contain covertly under them the thing itself that they signify, and that according to Christ's promise; verily this saying covertly containeth a great untruth. For as he is not able to allege any ancient learned Father that ever once mentioned this privy and secret being under such covert, so he is not able to show that Christ ever made him any such promise touching the same." (Harding, Thess., etc., P.S. Edit., p. 602.)

VI.

"It appeareth by the witness of the ancient learned doctors and fathers, that we are really and corporally joined and united unto Christ, not only by the mysteries of the holy Supper, but also by faith, by baptism, by the Spirit of God, by love, and other ways." (Apology and Defence, P.S. Edit., p. 494.)

VII.

"St. Augustine saith: 'They washed their coats in the blood of the Lamb, that is to say, in the grace of God through Christ.' This grace flowing from Christ's body upon the cross, and given to the faithful in the ministration

of the holy mysteries, oftentimes beareth the name of Christ's body, and is the ground and substance of the sacrament; and whosoever is partaker *of this grace is also partaker of Christ's body.* Therefore St. Augustine saith: 'Whereas the sacraments were common to all, yet the grace thereof was not common to all: and that is the power and strength of the sacraments.' . . . Here M. Harding once again moveth a very needless question. 'We demand,' saith he, 'whether we receive the same body of Christ by faith only, without our body, or with the office of our body.' Any child might soon be able to assoil this riddle. Rabanus Maurus saith, as it is alleged before; The *sacrament* is received with the *bodily* mouth; but with *the virtue* of the sacrament (which is the *body of Christ*) the *inner man* (that is, not the body, but the soul) *is filled.*" (Ibid, p. 487.)

VIII.

"Now, as the body of Christ is seen, so is it touched; and, as it is touched, so is it eaten. But it is *not seen with bodily eyes;* it is not *touched with bodily fingers;* for St. Ambrose saith: 'By FAITH *Christ is touched;* by FAITH *Christ is seen.*' Therefore the body of Christ is NOT EATEN *with the bodily mouth,* but ONLY *by* FAITH, which is the *spiritual mouth of the* soul." (Ibid, p. 531.)

IX.

"Again he saith: 'Whoso abideth not in Christ, nor Christ in him, out of doubt he eateth not spiritually His flesh, nor drinketh His blood; notwithstanding carnally

(that is to say with the bodily mouth) and visibly he do press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; and rather eateth and drinketh (NOT CHRIST'S VERY BODY and BLOOD, *but*) the *sacrament* of so great a thing, unto his judgment.' These words, M. Harding, be so plain, that I cannot imagine what ye should more desire. They are guilty of the blood of Christ, for that they despise the price wherewith they were saved, not for that they receive it really into their mouths.

"So St. Augustine saith again: 'The advouterer is guilty of everlasting death, because he despised in himself the blood of our Saviour.' The distinction that you imagine between REAL *receiving* in the wicked, and EFFECTUAL *receiving* in the godly, as it is only of yourself, without the authority of any doctor, Greek or Latin, so is it nothing else but a very 'effectual' and 'real' folly. For the very body of Christ, *if it be* NOT EFFECTUALLY received, IS NOT *received.* Christ Himself saith: 'He that eateth me shall live by me.' St. Ambrose saith: 'This bread is the remission of sins. He that receiveth it shall not die the death of a sinner.'" (Defence and Letters, p. 895.)

X.

"You may not negligently pass over these words, M. Harding: St. Augustine saith plainly: 'The THING itself that is represented by the sacrament (that is to say, THE VERY BODY OF CHRIST) is *received* of ALL MEN TO LIFE, and of NO MAN TO DESTRUCTION, whosoever shall be partaker of it.' Hereof you must needs conclude against yourself, that the WICKED *receive* NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST." (Ibid, p. 895.)

XI.

"Neither do we say that Christ, in the sixth chapter of John, speaking of the spiritual eating by faith, made mention of any figure, but only of HIS VERY FLESH AND VERY BLOOD, INDEED AND VERILY TO BE EATEN AND DRUNKEN. Notwithstanding we say that Christ, afterward in His last supper, unto the same spiritual eating *added* also an *outward sacrament*, which of the old Fathers is oftentimes and commonly called a *figure*." (Sermon and Harding, p. 453.)

XII.

"And St. Augustine saith: 'The *sacrament* is received from the Lord's table, of some unto life, of some unto destruction: but THE THING ITSELF whereof it is a sacrament (*that is, the body of Christ*) is *received of* EVERY MAN *unto life*, and of no man unto destruction, whosoever be partaker of it." (Ibid, p. 453.)

XIII.

"Therefore *wicked* men, and such as BELIEVE *not, receive* NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST: they have NO PORTION *in it.* So saith Origen: 'The body of Christ is the true food, which no evil man can eat; for, if the evil man could eat the body of our Lord, it should not be written, 'He that eateth this bread shall live for ever.'" (Harding, Thess., p. 1120.)

XIV.

"This is the undoubted meaning of the old Fathers, that the *wicked are* NOT PARTAKERS *of the passion of Christ*, because they lack FAITH, *whereby* ONLY *Christ is received* of us. As Augustine saith: 'How shall I hold Christ, being

absent? how shall I thrust my hand up into heaven, that I may hold Him sitting there? Send up thy faith, and thou holdest Him.' By this means we draw nigh to Christ, we hide ourselves in His wounds, we suck at His breast, we feed of His body, and comfortably lay up in our mind that His flesh was crucified and wounded for our sakes." (Ibid, p. 1121.)

XV.

"The *sacrament* is eaten as well of the wicked as of the faithful: *the* BODY is *only eaten of the* FAITHFUL. The *sacrament* may be eaten unto judgment; *the* BODY *cannot be eaten but unto* SALVATION. *Without the* SACRAMENT we may be saved; but *without the* BODY OF CHRIST we have *no salvation*, we cannot be saved. As St. Augustine saith: 'He that receiveth not the flesh of Christ hath not life; and he that receiveth the same hath life, and that for ever." (Ibid, pp. 1121, 1122.)

XVI.

"But Christ, when He spake these words, meant not the receiving of the sacrament, but the spiritual EATING OF HIS VERY BODY, and the spiritual *drinking* of His very blood; whereof *he is made partaker* unto resurrection and life everlasting, *whosoever* BELIEVETH *in the death of Christ*." (Apology and Defence, p. 532.)

XVII.

"Verily, Christ promised His body to be received by *faith*, and *by* FAITH ONLY, and none otherwise." (Ibid, p. 532.)

XVIII.

"St. Chrysostom concludeth thus: 'The thing that we do is done in remembrance of that thing that was done before. For Christ said, Do this in my remembrance. Hereby it appeareth in *what sense* the old Fathers used these words, '*oblation*' and '*sacrifice.*'" (Sermons and Harding, p. 171.)

XIX.

"Now, touching the adoration* of the sacrament, M. Harding is not able to shew neither any commandment of Christ, nor any word or example of the Apostles or ancient Fathers concerning the same. It is a thing very lately devised by Pope Honorius, about the year of our Lord 1226; afterward increased by the new solemn feast of Corpus Christi day, by Pope Urbanus, Anno 1264; and last of all confirmed for ever by multitudes of pardons in the council of Vienna by Pope Clement the fifth, anno 1310. The Church of Asia and Græcia never received it until this day. The matter is great, and cannot be attempted without great danger. To give the honour of God to a creature that is no God, it is manifest idolatry. And 'all idolaters,' as St. John saith, 'shall have their portion in the lake burning

* The reader is particularly requested to observe Jewel's sayings concerning "Adoration," because he too (like Ridley) has spoken of *worshipping* the elements, saying in his reply to Harding: "Neither do we only adore Christ, as very God, but also we WORSHIP *and reverence* the Sacrament and holy mystery of Christ's body." Words which appear to have been strangely misunderstood in a paper published under the title, "Was John Jewell a heretic?" (Pickering.) See note above on Ridley.

with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.'" (Sermons and Harding, p. 516.)

XX.

"Origen in that whole place speaketh not one word, *neither of* WORSHIPPING *the* SACRAMENT nor of Christ's REAL *or* CORPORAL BEING *therein*, nor of material entering into our bodies." (Ibid, p. 536.)

XXI.

"If M. Harding will gather hereof that Origen teacheth us to adore the sacrament, then must he also say that Origen likewise teacheth us to adore the bishop, or any other godly man, and that even as God, and with godly honour." (Ibid, p. 537.)

XXII.

"But M. Harding will reply, Chrysostom saith: 'As Christ was in the stall, so He is now upon the altar; and as He was sometimes in the woman's arms, so He is now in the priest's hands.' True it is Christ was there, and Christ is here; but not in one or like sort of being. For He was in the stall by BODILY PRESENCE; upon the holy table He is by *way of a* SACRAMENT. The woman in her arms held Him REALLY; the priest in his hands holdeth Him only *in a* MYSTERY. So saith St. Paul: 'Christ dwelleth in our hearts;' and no doubt the same Christ that lay in the stall. It is one and the same Christ; but the difference standeth in the manner of His being there: for in the stall He lay by presence of His body; in our hearts He lieth by presence of faith. If this exposition seem to M. Harding

over exquisite or curious, then will I say further: Christ is so upon the table as the faithful people is upon the table. St. Augustine, speaking to the people, saith thus: 'You are upon the table, you are in the cup.' But the people is not there grossly, really, and indeed, but in a mystery. Even so is Christ's body upon the table, not grossly, not REALLY, or *indeed*, but *in a* MYSTERY." (Ibid, p. 539.)

"But they will reply, St. Ambrose saith: 'We do adore Christ's flesh in the mysteries.' Hereof groweth their whole error. For St. Ambrose saith not, we do adore the mysteries, or the flesh of Christ really present, or *materially contained in the mysteries;* as it is supposed by M. Harding. Only he saith: 'We adore Christ's flesh in the mysteries,' that is to say, in the ministration of the mysteries. . . . But THIS *adoration* . . . neither is directed to the sacraments nor requireth any CORPORAL OR REAL PRESENCE. So St. Hierome saith: 'Paula adored Christ in the stall,' and that he himself adored Christ in the grave.

"And St. Chrysostom teacheth us to adore Christ's body in the sacrament of Baptism. Yet neither was Christ's body then really present in the stall,* or grave;

* Harding had quoted from St. Ambrose, "Per scabellum terra intelligitur, per terram autem caro Christi, quam hodie quoque in mysteriis adoramus." Jewel argues that *such* adoration was paid to Christ in the stall and the grave, when Christ was no longer really present in either.

Dr. Pusey has said, "The question then, as to the adoration of our Lord present in the Holy Eucharist, should be considered, apart from any notion of seeming unfitness. People have profanely spoken of 'wafer-gods.' They might as well have spoken of 'fire-gods.' . . . .

nor is it now present in the water of Baptism. Thus St. Ambrose saith, 'We adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries.'" (Ibid, pp. 542, 543.)

Much more might they have used the title, 'Infant God,' as a term of reproach against the Holy Child, Jesus. The simple question is, 'Is our Lord and God present there?' If, or rather since, He is present there, the outward appearance is no more hindrance to us, than the dress which He wore as man."

I can hardly think that some portion of the above was not somewhat hastily written. 'The Holy Child Jesus' was *a* DIVINE PERSON *incarnate*, having taken upon Him our flesh, 'so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood were joined together *in* ONE PERSON, never to be divided." (Art. ii.) Is it really meant that on the Altar *a* DIVINE PERSON becomes in like manner *impanate*, so that two whole and perfect natures, the nature of Christ and the nature of bread, should be joined together *in* ONE PERSON? There are indeed some sayings of those who teach the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, which seem to make too near an approach to something like this; as where we read, "a real union—in the Incarnation between the Eternal WORD and man's nature, and in the Eucharist between the Person of Christ and the elements of bread and wine. . . . . What was done in the Incarnation is renewed in the sacrament." (Tracts for the Day, v., p. 16.) Again, "Both in the Incarnation and in the Eucharist the mystery is formed by the union of two natures, which remain distinct without mixture or confusion." (Ibid, p. 17.) Again, "To say that He . . . WAS MADE MAN, enforces the additional confession that . . . He *incarnates* Himself, so to say, in the *bread and wine* of the holy Eucharist. . . . The Eucharist is the *Complement* and *Extension* of the *Incarnation*." (Ibid, p. 44.) But I cannot suppose that either Dr. Pusey or the writer of the Tract would maintain *such* an *impanation*. And indeed it may perhaps be said that the words of Dr. Pusey, in the context, shew that he is only maintaining *a Presence*, and that the outward forms should not hinder that Presence from being adored. But to this it must be answered—that not every presence of God is *adorable*. God is present everywhere. God was present in the golden calf. Yet not the less did His people commit idolatry when they worshipped Him *under the*

XXIII.

"So if M. Harding will likewise demand wherefore we adore not the sacrament with godly honour, the godly

form of a graven image. In like manner it seems to me, there is peril of idolatry in worshipping the presence of God under *any other form*, unless that presence be indeed either, (1,) Such a presence as that of the *Incarnate Word*, which is of necessity *adorable*, (such a presence, as that we should be able to say to the very present visible object of our adoration, as to *a* PERSON 'My Lord and My God,' 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God); or, (2,) A presence with such a manifestation as commands adoration, or, (3,) A presence with direct injunction to adore. Tyndale has said, "If they will say, where Christ's blood is, there is His body, and where His body is there is His soul, and where His soul is there is the Godhead and the Trinity. . . . . And there men ought to pray, and say, 'O Father, which art present with Thy Son, Christ, under bread and wine, or in form of bread and wine' . . . . then as the old prophet for like idolatry denieth God to dwell in the temple . . . . even so deny I the body of Christ to be any more in the sacrament than God was in the golden calves . . . . for though God be present everywhere, yet if heaven of heavens cannot compass him . . . . and much less the temple that was at Jerusalem, how should He have a dwelling place in a little wafer or crumb of bread? . . . . Christ, though He affirmed Himself to be the Son of God, and His Father to be in Him, yet He taught not His disciples to direct the prayer to the Father in Him, but up to the Father in heaven; neither lift He up His eyes to His Father in the sacrament, but to His Father in heaven. . . . . Though God's presence be everywhere, yet will He be prayed to up the place only where we shall see Him, and where He would have us to long for to be." (Doctrinal Treasures, P. S. Edit., pp. 381—383.)

Bishop Jeremy Taylor says: "The commandment to worship God alone is so express; the distance between GOD and BREAD dedicated to the service of God is so VAST, the DANGER of worshipping that which is NOT GOD, or of not worshipping that which is God, is so FORMIDABLE, that it is infinitely to be presumed that if it had been intended that we should have worshipped the holy sacrament, the Holy Scripture would have called it God, or Jesus Christ, or have

simple man may make him this answer: Because it was ordained reverently to be received, and not to be adored, as a sacrament, and not as God." (Ibid, p. 551.)

BIDDEN US *in express terms* to have adored it; that either by the first, as by a reason indicative, or by the second, as by a reason imperative, we might have had sufficient warrant direct or consequent to have paid a divine worship. Now that there is no implicit warrant in the sacramental words of 'This is my body,' I have given very many reasons to evince, by proving the words to be sacramental and figurative. Add to this, that supposing Christ present in their senses, yet as they have ordered the business, they have made it superstitious and idolatrical; for they declare that 'the divine worship does belong also to the symbols of bread and wine, as being one with Christ;' they are the words of Bellarmine; that even the species also with Christ are to be adored, so Suarez; which doctrine might upon the supposal of their grounds be excused, if, as Claudius de Sainctes dreamed, they and the body of Christ had *but one existence;* but this themselves admit not of, but he is confuted by Suarez. But then let it be considered, that since those species or accidents are not inherent in the holy body, nor have their existence from it, but wholly subsist by themselves (as they dream), since between them and the holy body there is *no substantial*, NO PERSONAL UNION, it is not imaginable how they can pass divine worship to those accidents which are not *in the body*, nor *the same with the body*, but by an impossible supposition subsist of themselves, and were proper to bread, and now *not communicable to Christ*, and yet NOT COMMIT IDOLATRY; especially since the Nestorians were by the fathers called ἀνθρωπολάτραι, or 'worshippers of a man,' because they worshipped THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST, which they supposed not to be 'personally' but 'habitually' united to the divinity." (Real Presence, Sect. xiii. 1, vol. vi., p. 163.)

Archbishop Usher says: "They who opposed the idolatry of those times, and more especially the 338 bishops assembled together at the Council of Constantinople, in the year 754, maintained that Christ 'Chose no other SHAPE OR TYPE under heaven to represent his incarnation by, but the *sacrament,*' which 'he delivered to his ministers for a TYPE and a most *effectual* COMMEMORATION thereof;' 'command-

Hooker.

Richard Hooker, born 1554. Through the kindness of Bishop Jewel, he was sent to study at Oxford, where he became fellow of C.C.C. He was made master of the Temple in 1585, when he became involved in controversy with the Puritan Walter Travers. Four books of his "Ecclesiastical Polity" were published in 1594, a fifth in 1597, and the last three after his death. He died at Bishopsbourne in 1600.

The extracts following (all but the last) are taken from Hooker's great work "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity," written to defend the Church of England against her assailants.

I.

"It followeth that nothing of Christ which is limited, that nothing created, that neither the soul nor the body of

ing the *substance of* BREAD to be offered, which did not any way *resemble the form of a man*, that so NO OCCASION *might be given of bringing in* IDOLATRY:' which bread they affirmed to be the body of Christ, not φύσει, but θέσει; that is, as they themselves expound it, 'a holy' and 'a true IMAGE *of his* NATURAL FLESH.'" (Archbishop Usher, Answer to Jesuit's Challenge, in Works; vol. iii., pp. 79, 80.)

"Fiat, quod fieri voluit Christus cum dixit, *Hoc facite;* nihil reliqui fiet, quod monstret Sacerdos, quod adoret populus, de pyxide." (Bishop Andrewes, Responsio ad Bellarm: Edit. Oxford, p. 267.)

Canon Trevor writes: "When it is known that not a word of 'Eucharistic adoration' exists for a thousand years after Christ, thoughtful men will be inclined to test the sacramental presence by the proved absence of adoration, rather than graft the adoration on a particular interpretation of the presence. That Christ is to be adored wherever he is, is a truism which no Christian disputes; ['in et cum Sacramento; . . ubi ubi est, adorandus est." Bishop Andrewes], but when it is said that he is to be adored in the sacrament, the question returns upon us whether 'sacrament' means the visible symbols of his body and blood, or the whole rite in which he is undoubtedly present to the faithful communicant? In the latter sense we all adore him." (Sacrifice and Participation, p. 108.)

Christ, and consequently not *Christ as man* or Christ according to *His human nature can possibly* be everywhere present. . . . . That which excludeth Him therefore as man from so great largeness of presence, is only His being *man*, a creature *of this particular kind*,* whereunto the God of nature hath set those bounds of restraint and limitation,†

* These italics are Hooker's.

† The reader is asked carefully to observe that Hooker (after the example of other Reformers) grounds his argument against *ubiquity*, not at all on the necessity of *some* limitations of the capacity of Christ's body of being spiritually present (see "Tracts for the Day," v., pp. 40, 41), but upon the *impossibility* of *Christ's body* (because it is a TRUE HUMAN BODY) being REALLY *present* AT ALL in more places than one, though its presence of conjunction with Deity, of operation and efficacy, which is *after a sort* presence, be altogether unlimited. Hooker teaches plainly that Christ's body *is* (because of its *truth*) subject to all the limitations with which ours is bounded. His argument seems to have been misunderstood by the writer of "Tracts for the Day," No. V., who (p. 36) after quoting from Hooker, says: "It is this conjunction with Deity that gives to our *Lord's body* a *capacity of presence* and of action beyond the sphere of that locality which He occupies in Heaven. It sets Him free from the laws which limit the operations of other bodies." And again (p. 35): "It (Christ's body) is still consubstantial with ours, yet not subject to the limitations with which ours is bounded." Again, when the writer says (p. 13), "When Hooker says that we 'cannot participate Christ without His presence,' he means the presence of His human nature," it may be well to observe that the words quoted from Hooker are followed immediately by these: "We are briefly to consider HOW Christ *is present*" (vol. ii., p. 238); and that Hooker's treatment of this subject excludes ANY *presence* of Christ's *body on earth*, and "any *mixture* of the *substance* of His flesh with ours." (Page 255.)

In another part of the same tract (p. 29) are quoted the following words of Bishop Taylor concerning the body of Christ, which was crucified, dead and buried, and is now ascended: "I know none else

beyond which to attribute unto it anything more than a creature *of that sort* can admit, were to give it another nature. . . . . The substance of *the body of Christ* hath NO PRESENCE, neither *can have*, but *only* LOCAL. . . . There

(*i.e.*, no other body) that He had or hath; there is *but one* body of Christ natural and glorified . . . . . there is *no other body*." And these words are applied in support of an argument that the *same body* of Christ which is now in heaven *must needs* also be present with a real objective presence ("the presence of His very, true body—not anything different from the body which He had on earth, and which He took up into Heaven") under the form of bread in the Eucharist. The same words had also been cited by Dr. Pusey in "Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent," (p. 70.)

But Jeremy Taylor wrote those words as leading to an argument that there *cannot possibly* be *any* REAL PRESENCE *of that body* AT ALL on the altar or anywhere else than in heaven. Compare his words a little before (vol. vi., p. 17): "They say that Christ's body is truly present there as it was upon the cross, but not after the manner of all or any body, but after the manner of being as an angel is in a place; that's their 'spiritually:' but we by the 'real spiritual presence' of Christ do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing and grace; and this is all which we mean besides the tropical and figurative presence." And further on: "Here is the first CONTRADICTION. The body of Christ is in *the sacrament:* the *same body* is in *heaven*." (Page 105.) And again: "When we speak of a body, all the world means that which hath a *finite* quantity, and is *determined to one place*." (p. 106.) And again: "To make the body of Christ to be in a thousand places at once and yet to be but ONE BODY, to be *in heaven* and to be upon *so many altars*, to be on the altar in so many round wafers, is to make a body to be a spirit, and to make a finite to be infinite. . . . Neither will it be sufficient to fly here to God's omnipotency." (Page 107.) And again: "That the omnipresence of God should be brought to prove *it possible* that a *body* may be in *many places*, truly though I am heartily desirous to do it, if I could justly, yet I cannot find any colour to excuse it from *great impiety*." (Page 117.)

is no proof in the world strong enough to enforce that Christ had a TRUE *body* but by the *true* and *natural* properties of His body. Amongst which properties, DEFINITE or LOCAL *presence* is chief. . . . . If His *majestical* body

Truly it is a strange argument of Bellarmine in favour of the corporal presence: "Qui dicit, inter ea, quæ potest Deus, esse etiam, ponere *unum corpus in pluribus locis*, hic Deum exaltat, et hominem deprimit, cum fateatur plura posse facere, quam nos intelligamus." ("De Sacr. Euch.," lib. iii., cap. iii., p. 662.)

There is a wide difference between Divine truths which are *above* our apprehension (before which our reason is to bow down, and our vain thoughts to be hushed in reverent submission), and assertions which we discern by the understanding which God has given us to be actually absurd. "We can never assent," says Locke, "to a proposition that affirms *the same body* to be in *two distant places* at once, however it should pretend to the authority of a divine revelation: since the evidence, first, that we *deceive not ourselves* in *ascribing it to God*, and secondly, that we *understand it right*, can NEVER BE SO GREAT as the evidence of our own intuitive knowledge, whereby WE DISCERN IT IMPOSSIBLE." "On Human Understanding," iv., c. 18, quoted by Archdeacon Martin ("Answer to Bishop of Salisbury," p. 108), who says (pp. 100—104): "If it be pretended, that in the consecrated elements there be hidden any body, not only invisible and impalpable, but unextended also and unfigured, and not locally in place; then that pretended body is certainly not Christ's real body, but a vain imagination, or an idol which is 'nothing in the world.' . . . . Vain is an appeal to the omnipotence of God, which was called of old 'the sanctuary of heretics:' for thus men might fain, as a Father said, 'quid vis,' whatever you please, of God: and so, for example, the Arians did feign, that the Omnipotent could make Christ, a creature, to be God. But the answer was, and is, that omnipotence cannot make false things not false, or two contradictory propositions to be true together: and in this case the contradictions are endless. . . . . For the Catholic faith is, that the human nature of Christ '*is, and was, of the same species with ours.*' (Bellarm., lib. iii., de Christo, c. ii.) Nor can omnipotence cause, that the same one body

have now any such *new* property, by force whereof it may everywhere even *in substance* present itself, or may at once be in many places, then hath the *majesty of His estate* extinguished the VERITY *of His nature.*" (Keble's Edit., vol. ii., pp. 240—242.)

II.

"His human substance in itself is naturally absent from the earth, His soul and body *not on earth* but in *heaven* ONLY. Yet because this substance is *inseparably joined* to that personal word which by His very divine essence is present with all things, the nature which cannot have in itself universal presence hath it *after a sort* by being *nowhere* severed from that which everywhere is present. . . . . .

should be here organical, and there 'not organical;' or that it should occupy an entire loaf, and yet be whole in every part thereof; or be at once circumscribed, and yet present substantially beyond its outer surface. . . . . These, and many other consequences of this substantial presence, are evident and direct contradictions: and if so, as Roman doctors admit, they are beyond the limits of omnipotence—which cannot make anything false and true, or to be and not to be, at the same time."

Dr. Isaac Barrow says: "The Holy Scripture teacheth us that our Lord hath departed, and is absent from us in body. . . . But the Pope and his Lateran and Tridentine complices, draw him down from heaven, and make him CORPORALLY PRESENT every day, in *numberless places* here. The Scripture teacheth us that our Lord is a man, PERFECTLY LIKE TO US, *in all things.* But the Pope and his adherents make him EXTREMELY DIFFERENT from us, as having a body *at once* present in *innumerable* places; insensible, etc., divested of the properties of our body; thereby *destroying his human nature,* and in effect agreeing with Eutyches, Apollinarius, and other such pestilent heretics." (Of the Pope's Supremacy, in Works, Edit: 168 ; vol. i. p. 285.)

Presence *by way of conjunction* is in some sort presence. . . . . His bodily substance hath everywhere a presence of true conjunction with Deity. . . . . As every number is infinite by possibility of addition, and every line by possibility of extension infinite, so there is no stint which can be set to the *value or merit of the sacrificed body of Christ;* it hath no measured certainty of limits, *bounds of efficacy* unto life it knoweth none, but is also itself infinite in *possibility of application.*" (Ibid, pp. 242—245.)

III.

"As for any *mixture of the* SUBSTANCE OF HIS FLESH WITH OURS, the participation which we have of Christ includeth no *such* kind of *gross* surmise." * (Ibid, p. 255.)

IV.

"The question is yet driven to a narrower issue, nor doth anything rest doubtful but this, whether when the sacrament is administered Christ be whole *within man only*, or else *His body and blood* be also *externally seated* in the very *consecrated elements* themselves; which opinion they that defend are driven either to *consubstantiate* and incorporate Christ with elements sacramental, or to *transubstantiate* and change their substance into His; and so the one to hold Him *really* but *invisibly* moulded up with the substance of those elements, the other to hide Him under the only visible show of bread and wine, the substance whereof as

* Contrast "He unites His sacred flesh to ours . . . . . and in order to this union of the flesh of Christ with ours, He first incarnates Himself in the hands of the priest." ("Tracts for the Day," v., p. 16.)

they imagine is abolished and His succeeded in the same room." (Ibid, pp. 349, 350.)

v.

"That strong conceit which two * of the three have embraced as touching *a literal, corporal and oral manducation of the very substance of His flesh and blood* is surely an opinion nowhere delivered in Holy Scripture, whereby they should think themselves bound to believe it, and (to speak

* Hooker (leaving outside the views of those who would assign to the Sacrament no end but only to teach the mind, vol. ii. p. 255, and account the Eucharist only a shadow—destitute, empty, and void of Christ) divides the opinions concerning the Lord's Supper under three heads: 1st, The Lutherans' interpretation, or consubstantiation (see pp. 359 and 349); 2nd, The Popish construction, or transubstantiation (see pp. 359 and 349); and, 3rd, The opinion of those termed "Sacramentaries" (pp. 355 and 359), among whom he ranges himself.

In like manner Tyndale (Doctrinal Treatises, P. S. Edit., pp. 366 and 367): "Ye shall understand that there is great dissension, and *three opinions*, about the words of Christ. . . . . One part say that these words, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' compel us to believe, under pain of damnation, that the bread and wine are changed into the very body and blood of Christ really.' . . . . The second part saith: 'We be not bound to believe that bread and wine are changed; but only that His body and blood are there presently.' The third say: 'We be bound by these words only to believe that Christ's body was broken and His blood shed, for the remission of sins; and that there is no other satisfaction for sin than the death and passion of Christ.'" He adds: "The chief hold and principal anchor that the two first have, is these words: 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood.' Unto these the third answereth as is above said. Other texts they [*i.e.* the Lutherans and Papists] allege for themselves, which not only do not strengthen their cause, but rather make it worse: as the sixth of John; which they draw and wrest to the carnal and fleshly eating of Christ's body in the mouth, when it only meaneth of this eating by faith." (Pages 368 and 369.)

with the softest terms we can use) greatly prejudiced in that when some others did so conceive of eating His flesh, our Saviour to abate that error in them gave them directly to understand how His flesh so eaten could profit them nothing, because the words which He spake were spirit; that is to say, they had a reference to a mystical participation, which mystical participation giveth life." (Ibid, pp. 355, 356.)

VI.

"Neither is it ordinarily His will to bestow the grace of sacraments on any, but by the sacraments; *which grace* also they that receive by sacraments or with sacraments, *receive it from* HIM and *not from* THEM. For of sacraments the very same is true which Solomon's wisdom observeth in the brazen serpent; he that turned towards it was not healed 'by the thing he saw, but by Thee, O Saviour of all.'" ("Eccles. Polity," vol. ii., p. 258, Keble Edit.)

VII.

"The sacraments *contain in themselves* no vital force or efficacy, they are not physical but moral instruments of salvation, duties of service and worship, which unless we perform as the Author of grace requireth, they are unprofitable." (Ibid, p. 257.)

VIII.

"The REAL PRESENCE of Christ's most blessed body and blood is *not* therefore to be sought for *in the sacrament*, but in the *worthy receiver of the sacrament*.

And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth: first 'Take and eat;' then, 'This is my body which

was broken for you:' first 'Drink ye all of this;' then followeth 'This is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them. As for the sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow." (Ibid, p. 352, 353.)

IX.

"Touching the ministry of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; the whole body of the Church being divided into laity and clergy, the clergy are either presbyters or deacons. I rather term the one sort *Presbyters* than *Priests*, because in a matter of so small moment I would not willingly offend their ears to whom the name of *Priesthood* is odious though without cause. . . . . Howbeit because the most eminent part both of heathenish and Jewish service did consist in sacrifice, when learned men declare what the word *Priest* doth *properly* signify *according to the mind of the first imposer* of that name, their ordinary scholies do well expound it to imply *sacrifice*. Seeing then that SACRIFICE *is now no part of the Church ministry* how should the name of *Priesthood* be thereunto rightly applied? Surely even as St. Paul applieth the name of flesh unto that very substance of fishes which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although

it be in nature another thing. Whereupon when philosophers will speak warily, they make a difference between flesh in one sort of living creatures and that other substance in the rest which hath but a kind of analogy to flesh: the Apostle contrariwise having matter of greater importance whereof to speak nameth indifferently both flesh. The Fathers of the Church of Christ with like security of speech call usually the ministry of the Gospel *Priesthood* in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient *sacrifices*, namely the *Communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ*, although *it have properly now* NO SACRIFICE. As for the people when they hear the name it draweth no more *their minds* to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of a senator or of an alderman causeth them to think upon old age or to imagine that every one so termed must needs be ancient because years were respected in the first nomination of both.

"Wherefore to pass by the name, let them use what dialect they will, whether we call it a Priesthood, a Presbytership, or a Ministry it skilleth not: although in truth the word Presbyter doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable than *Priest* with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ. For what are they that embrace the Gospel but sons of God? What are Churches but His families? Seeing therefore we receive the adoption and state of sons by their ministry whom God hath chosen out for for that purpose, seeing also that when we are the sons of God, our continuance is still under their care which were our progenitors, what better title could there be given them

than the reverend name of Presbyters or fatherly guides? The Holy Ghost throughout the body of the New Testament making so much mention of them doth not anywhere call them Priests. The prophet Esay I grant doth; but in such sort as the ancient fathers, by way of analogy." (Ibid, pp. 469, 471, 472.)

X.

"Tell not us that ye will sacrifice to the Lord our God, if we will sacrifice to Ashtoreth or Melcom; that ye will read our Scriptures, if we will listen to your traditions; that if ye may have a mass by permission, we shall have a communion with good leave and liking; that ye will admit the things that are spoken of by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus, if your Lord and Master may have His ordinances observed and His statutes kept. Solomon took it (as well he might) for an evident proof, that she did not bear a motherly affection to her child, which yielded to have it cut in divers parts. He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart, which lendeth one ear to His Apostles, and another to false Apostles; which can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and superstition, ministers and massing-priests, light and darkness, truth and error, traditions and scriptures." (Vol. iii., p. 666.)

Pilkington.

James Pilkington, born 1520. Educated at Cambridge; elected fellow of St. John's College, 1539. In 1550 he was appointed by Edward VI. to the vicarage of Kendal, in Westmoreland. In 1554, to avoid persecution, he left England, living at Zurich, Basil, and Geneva. On Elizabeth's accession he was appointed one of the

commissioners for the revision of the Book of Common Prayer. In 1561 he was consecrated first Protestant Bishop of Durham. He died in 1575.

In 1561, Pilkington preached a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, on the destruction of St. Paul's Cathedral by lightning. This called forth an angry reply from a Papist, who attributed the calamity to God's judgment to "schismatical service," "pulling down altars," etc. In answer to this Pilkington wrote the work from which the following extracts are made.

I.

"The Church of God, according to the Scriptures, does profess and believe that all faithful Christians, worthily coming to the Lord's Table, receive *by* FAITH in those holy mysteries the *body and blood of Christ*, which was given, broken and shed for the sins of the whole world. This we teach, believe and follow, and exhort all men often to prepare themselves worthily thus to receive." (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 552.)

II.

"Wheresoever, therefore, the New Testament or Old writers use this word *altar*, they allude to that *sacrifice* of Christ, figured by Moses, and use the word still that Moses used to signify the *same sacrifice* withal; and rather it is a *figurative*, than a *proper* kind of speech in all such places. And because *altars* were ever used for *sacrifices*, to signify that *sacrifice* which was to come, seeing our Saviour Christ is come already, has fulfilled and *finished* all *sacrifices*, we think it best to take away all occasions of that Popish sacrificing mass (for maintaining whereof they have cruelly

sacrificed many innocent souls) to minister on tables, according to these examples." (Ibid, p. 547.)

III.

"For their sacrifice of the mass, that he so much laments to be defaced, and all good consciences rejoice that God of His undeserved goodness has overthrown it, I refer all men to the fifth and last book that the blessed souls now living with God, Bishops Cranmer and Ridley, wrote of the sacrament, whose bodies they cruelly tormented therefore. There whosoever lust, may read, and with indifferency weigh the reasons of both parties, and judge with the truth. Stout Stephen would gladly have overthrown that book: but God confounded him, and their names live for ever. So long as that book stands unconfuted, they may bark against the truth, as the dog does against the moon, and not prevail." (Ibid, pp. 547, 548.)

Rogers.

Thomas Rogers, an eminent theologian, educated at Oxford, where he entered 1568. He was chaplain to Bancroft, Bishop of London. He died 1615.

The extracts are from his "Exposition of the Articles," published in 1586. A corrected edition was put forth in 1607, as "perused, and by the lawful authority of the Church of England allowed to be public," and which the Archbishop ordered all the parishes in his province to supply themselves with. (See Goode, Rule of Faith, vol. ii., p. 288.)

I.

"Which spiritual bread, that He might the better repre-

sent, He hath instituted earthly and visible bread and wine, for a sacrament of His body and blood. Whereby He doth testify, that as verily as we receive the bread with the hands, and chew the same with the teeth and tongue, to the nourishing of this life temporal, even so *by* FAITH (which is in place of *hands and mouth to the soul*) we *verily receive the* TRUE BODY and the TRUE BLOOD OF CHRIST our only Saviour, to the cherishing of the spiritual life in our souls." (On Art., P. S. Edit., p. 288.)

II.

"*The adversaries unto this truth.*"

". . . . . The Synusiasts, or Ubiquitaries, which think the body of Christ so is present in the Supper, as His said body, with bread and wine, by one and the same mouth, at one and the same time, of all and every communicant, is eaten corporally and received into the belly." (Ibid, p. 289.)

" Again, of others the same is unworthily received; that is to say, which themselves do not examine, nor judge, neither discern the Lord's body, and do communicate at the table of the Lord and at the table of devils. These may receive the sacrament, but not the true body of Christ." (Ibid, p. 292.)

III.

"*Error and adversaries unto this truth.*"

". . . . . The Ubiquitaries, *both Lutheran* and Popish; they saying the *very body of Christ*, at the Lord's Supper, *is eaten as well of the wicked as of the godly;* these affirming,

that all communicants, bad and good, do eat the very and natural body of Christ Jesus." (Ibid, p. 293.)

IV.

"It is a fable that the mass is a sacrifice, and that propitiatory; . . . . a fable, that one and the same sacrifice is offered in the mass which was offered on the cross; a fable, that the said mass is any whit profitable for the quick, much less for the dead." (Ibid, p. 300.)

V.

"Dangerous deceits. For hereby men are to believe that . . . . Christ is *often offered;* contrary to the Scripture. . . . . The priest offereth up Christ; contrary to the Scripture. . . . . We are to *adore Christ* as always *present;* contrary to the Scripture, where we are taught to *remember Him absent.*" (Ibid, p. 301.)

SANDYS.

Edwin Sandys, (or Sandes,) born 1519: was educated at Cambridge, and in 1547 was elected master of Catharine Hall. In Queen Mary's reign he was imprisoned with John Bradford, but by mediation of Sir Thomas Holcroft, was released. He escaped abroad, and remained for awhile at Strasbourg, whence, on his wife's death, he removed to Zurich, where he lived in the house of Peter Martyr. Returning to England, after Mary's death, he was consecrated Bishop of Worcester in 1559, together with Grindall (London), Cox (Ely), and Merick (Bangor). He was employed upon the Bishops' Bible. In 1570 he was made Bishop of London. And when Grindall, whom he had succeeded in London, was moved from York to Canterbury in 1576, Sandys took his place at York. He died in July, 1588.

The extracts are taken from sermons published in 1585.

I.

"In this sacrament there are two things, a visible sign, and an invisible grace: there is a visible sacramental sign of bread and wine, and there is the thing and matter signified, namely, the body and blood of Christ; there is an earthly matter, and an heavenly matter. The outward sacramental sign is common to all; as well the bad, as the good. Judas received the Lord's bread; but not that bread which is the Lord to the faithful receiver. The *spiritual part*, that which feedeth the soul, ONLY THE FAITHFUL *do receive*. For he cannot be partaker of the body of Christ, which is no member of Christ's body." (Sermons, P. S. Edit., p. 88.)

II.

...."Whom the heavens shall keep until the latter day. From *thence* and from no other *altar* shall he come, in his natural body, to judge both quick and dead. His natural BODY is LOCAL, for *else it were not a natural body:* His *body* is THERE, therefore not HERE: for a natural *body* doth not occupy *sundry places at once*. Here we have a *sacrament*, a sign, a memorial, a commemoration, a representation, a figure effectual, of the body and blood of Christ." (Ibid, p. 88.)

III.

"By FAITH He is *seen*, by FAITH He is *touched*, by FAITH He is *digested*. Spiritually BY FAITH we *feed upon Christ, when we stedfastly believe that His body was broken, and His blood shed for us upon the cross;* by which sacrifice, offered

once for all, as sufficient for all, our sins were freely remitted, blotted out, and washed away. *This* is *our heavenly bread*, our *spiritual food*. This doth strengthen our souls and cheer our hearts. Sweeter it is unto us than honey, when we are certified by this outward sacrament of the inward grace given unto us through His death, when in Him we are assured of remission of sins and eternal life. Better food than this thy soul can never feed upon. This is the bread of everlasting life. *They which truly eat it shall live by it.*" (Ibid, p. 89.)

IV

"If a prince gave out his letters patent of a gift, so long as the seal is not put to, the gift is not fully ratified; and the party to whom it is given thinketh not himself sufficiently assured of it. God's gift, without sealing, is sure; as He Himself is all one, without changing: yet, to bear with our infirmity, and to make us more secure of His promise, to His writing and word He added these outward signs and seals, to establish our faith, and to certify us that His promise is most certain. He giveth us therefore these holy and visible signs of bread and wine, and saith, 'Take and eat, this is my body and blood;' *giving unto the signs* the names which are *proper to the things signified* by them; as we used to do even in common speech, when the sign is a lively representation and image of the thing." (Ibid, pp. 303, 304.)

Willet.

Andrew Willet, born 1262. (His father had been sub-almoner to King Edward, and a sufferer during the persecutions in Queen Mary's reign.) Was Prebendary of Ely; he is said to have been usually called a living library, from the great extent of his reading and of his memory. He was very celebrated as a preacher, and for his work "Synopsis Papismi" dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. He died in 1621.

I.

"This then is our faith and judgment, that we are verily in this sacrament engrafted into the body of Christ, and do truly eat His flesh and drink His blood; but all this is done *spiritually* ONLY, and BY FAITH." (Quoted in Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 48.)

II.

"*The Protestants.*—That wicked men and infidels CANNOT *in any sense* BE PARTAKERS of the true body and blood of Christ." (Ibid, p. 72.)

III.

"And in this sense we deny not, but that the sacrament may be called a sacrifice, that is, a spiritual oblation of praise and thanksgiving; but that there is a proper and external sacrifice, as in the law of goats and bullocks, upon the cross of the body of Christ; so in the Eucharist, of the same body and flesh of Christ, we hold it for great blasphemy and heresy." (Ibid, p, 28.)

Here we close our review of passages selected from the writings of our English Reformers, for the purpose of instituting a comparison between their views on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and those of the maintainers of "the Real Objective Presence." No name has been designedly omitted. The list includes the High Churchmen of the period, as well as some who may be said to have had leanings towards the Puritans. And some special pains have been taken to give a true and faithful representation of the views of those who have quoted been as supporting the doctrine in question. No doubt there are expressions to be found, which, taken alone, might be regarded as not altogether inconsistent with such a doctrine. And from a catena of such passages we might possibly rise impressed with something like a suspicion that some of our Reformers held some modification of the Lutheran view. But of all such extracts*

* How inconclusive such extracts are, and liable to mislead as to the real doctrinal views of the writers, may be exemplified by the following quotations from Swinnock. "Men set bread and wine *on the table*, but *Christ setteth* HIS OWN BODY AND BLOOD THERE." (Vol. i., Nichol's Edit., p. 173.) "'The gods,' say they, 'are come down in the likeness of men;'—behold, here God the Son *cometh down* IN THE LIKENESS OF BREAD AND WINE." (Ibid, p. 174.) If a Puritan could write thus after the controversies of the sixteenth century, can any one wonder at the language of the Fathers before (as I believe) Transubstantiation and the Real Objective Presence was ever heard of? ONE *testing exposition* of doctrine *neutralises* ALL such expressions. Luther conceded Augustine and Fulgentius. He said at the Conference at Marpurg: "*You have Augustine and Fulgentius*, but the rest of the Fathers are on our side." But if the Reformed party had Augustine and Fulgentius,—if, that is, Augustine and Fulgentius had passages in their writings which shewed their views to be against 'the Real Presence;" and if such declared views from men so prominent were not repudiated by other Fathers,—a strong argument may

it must be said that they are not testing passages; or rather, in them no real test has been applied to determine the manner of the presence taught. It is far otherwise with the extracts given above. They are purposely selected as testing passages. In them the views of each Reformer on this matter are brought out clearly and distinctly. Some in

be made, that having Augustine and Fulgentius we have the other Fathers also.

It would be easy to find many examples to illustrate the inconclusive character of unguarded statements to which no sufficient test has been applied. Let two suffice.

1. Bishop Beveridge has been appealed to and largely quoted from in support of the Real Objective Presence. Yet ONE *testing passage* manifests, with a clearness which can *hardly be exceeded*, how utterly repugnant were his views to any such doctrine :—"The *whole stress* of this great work lies upon OUR FAITH. Unless that be duly exerted and acted, though men come to the Lord's Table, and *feed upon the outward elements* which are there given them, this is *not to eat the Lord's Supper;* for that is a *spiritual* banquet, which *cannot be so much as* TASTED OF, *any otherwise than* BY FAITH. And therefore, they who do not receive it with faith have no cause to complain that they never are the better for receiving the Lord's Supper; for they do REALLY *receive it* NO MORE *than if they were* NOT PRESENT *when it is administered;* and so can expect no more benefit from it than from food or physic which they DO NOT TAKE." ("Frequent Communion," p. 313.)

2. Bishop Ken has also been claimed on the same side; and considering his fondness for using mystical language, it is not surprising that some passages from his writings should be quoted in support of the Real Objective Presence. But there was a pamphlet published by a Roman Catholic in the time of James II., containing animadversions on a sermon preached by him, and which the writer judged inconsistent with the Bishop's published views. From this pamphlet it is evident how the Bishop's doctrinal statements, when *tested*, were directly opposed to the Real Objective view. The writer says: "I saw you exhorted your 'people not to be tottered by every blast of

words repudiate "*the Real Presence*" altogether; and of the rest we may, I think, say that almost as with one mouth they repudiate those very views which are distinctive of the (so-called) "Real Objective Presence." Here is no hesitating, doubtful language. To have studied these extracts carefully, is to feel that we are no longer floating on uncertainties, that we have touched the bottom, that we rest on sure ground, that we *know* what our Reformers *did* think and feel about the doctrine of the Corporal Presence in their own days, that we know too what they *would have* thought and felt and said about the doctrine of the (so-called) Real Objective Presence as it is taught in our days. Here is brought together concurrent, uniform, consentient testimony to the belief that Christ's body and blood are *not* present in the Eucharist after the manner taught by modern Ritualists; for we find our Reformers teaching us that the body and blood of Christ are—

(1) Not to be sought in the elements.

(2) Not received by the unfaithful (except in the sense of receiving the bare outward signs, which *are not*,

wind, that shall say, Christ is on this altar, or Christ is on that altar, for Christ *is* ACTUALLY *in heaven, and shall* CONTINUE THERE *till He comes to judge at the end of the world.*'" Again: "Your lordship must needs maintain that *what Christ gave, amd His apostles received, was* NOTHING ELSE BUT BREAD AND WINE." (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 706—710, and 892—896.)

Archbishop Longley (Posthumous Charge, p. 29) has well said: "A SINGLE *disclaimer* of a meaning which might be attributed to his language, a SINGLE explanation on his part of what might otherwise be doubtful, a SINGLE *correction* of a phrase which might otherwise mislead, surely serves as a *general interpretation* of an author's meaning in other passages where the like correction or explanation does not occur."

though they *may be called* by the names of, the things signified).

(3) Not to be adored as present in or under the bread and wine.

(4) Not sacrificed or offered to God under the form of the bread and wine.

Our Reformers were, in fact, very jealous of allowing any such connexion of the *Sacramentum* and the *Res Sacramenti* as should seem either to give to the one, or in any way bind to the one, the honour due to the other.

Of the three things to be considered in the Eucharist—(1) The *Sacramentum*, or sign; (2) The *Res Sacramenti*, or thing signified; and (3) The *benefits* thereof—the Romish and real objective view made the two first inseparable, the third separable; but in the views of our Reformers the first is separable from the other two, but the second and third are absolutely *inseparable:* that is, in other words, by the opponents of the Reformation it is taught that, by reason of the sacramental conjunction, the bread and wine cannot be received without the body and blood of Christ (the sign not without the thing signified), though *these* may be received without any of their benefits—to the condemnation of the unworthy receiver. By the Reformers, on the other hand, it was steadfastly maintained that there is no possibility of separating the reception of the body and blood of Christ from the reception of the benefits which we receive from them. Unworthy receivers may, in their view, receive the outward sign without receiving Christ at all. But there can be no receiving Christ's body and blood without receiving their saving efficacy. And this reception, in their teaching, can only be by faith. Their views on this matter may be said

to be summed up in the words, "He that *eateth Me*, even he *shall live by Me*."

Yet in this view of our Reformers there was (as we shall see hereafter) no reducing the Lord's Supper to bare signs. They regarded Christ as *really present*, and *really** *offering* Himself and all the benefits of His passion and sacrifice to the souls of the communicants. And the guilt of unbelief was, in their view, the guilt of *rejecting and refusing*. They accounted unbelievers to be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, not because they received THESE (the body and blood of Christ) *unworthily*, but because, without faith they *could not* and DID NOT RECEIVE THEM AT ALL.†

* See Bradford's Sermons, etc., pp. 488 and 489; and Sandys' Sermons, pp. 302 and 303. "As the graces of God purchased for us by Christ are offered unto us by the Word, so are they also most lively and effectually by the Sacraments. . . . . All the graces which may flow from the body and blood of Christ Jesus, are in a mystery here *not represented only*, but *presented* unto us." So Jewell: "As Christ offereth His body spiritually to our faith and spirit, even so spiritually by our faith and spirit we receive it." (Apology and Defence, p. 529.) To the same effect Bullinger: "An objection is made: If sacraments do nothing profit without our faith, then they *depend on our worthiness* or unworthiness; so that they are *not perfect*. I answer, ... Neither dependeth their perfectness upon the condition and state of the partakers. . . . . For that remaineth *perfect and sound* which the Lord hath instituted . . . . howsoever men vary and are faithless. . . . . Yet because it is *one thing to offer*, and another thing to receive, God verily offereth of His goodness His bountiful gifts unto men to this end, to profit and save them . . . . but as the sick patient which refuseth physic, the benefit *offered* doth no more profit . . . not through the default of Him that *offereth* . . . . but through the folly of Him which *refuseth*." (Decades, v., pp. 342, 343.)

† See Bradford's Sermons, pp. 93, *sqq*. Jewel says: "Here St. Augustine saith, they are guilty, not because they *receive*, but because they *receive not* the body of Christ. Mark well these words,

It is indeed surprising how little hold the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist ever obtained in England. In the early part of Edward VI.'s reign things looked very different. There were great fears, and there was great

M. Harding; they are effectual. The wicked, by St. Augustine's judgment, are guilty, not because they *receive*, but because they *receive not* the body of Christ." (Defence of Apology, pp. 894, 895.) So Hutchinson: "These words do not prove that Christ's body is eaten of us really and substantially. For Paul speaketh there of *unworthy receivers*, which *do not* eat Christ's body, which is the bread of life, but the *only* figure and *sacrament* thereof. . . . . The *contempt* of God's *sacrament*, not the *contact* or *touching* of Christ's real body, which is now in heaven, bringeth damnation and causeth this guiltiness." (Works, p. 280.) So Cranmer: "You seem to drive all the cause of fear to the dignity of the body of Christ, there corporally present and received; but the Scripture declareth the fear to rise of the indignity and unworthiness of the receivers." (On Lord's Supper, p. 147.) And again: "He that cometh defiled unto the visible *sacraments*, defileth not *only* the *sacraments*, but the contumely thereof pertaineth also unto Christ Himself, who is the Author of the sacrament." (Page 225.) "Although the sacrament be very bread, yet doth the injury redound to the body of Christ. As if a man break the king's mace . . . . the injury is the king's, and the doer shall be taken as a traitor. . . . . Wherefore a man may unworthily take the sacrament, and be guilty of the death of Christ, although he receive not Christ's body into his mouth." (Grindal, "Remains," pp. 55, 56.) "*Non dicet Paulus*, Itaque quisquis *ederit corpus* Domini et biberit sanguinem Domini indigne: sed quia indigne sumentes *sacramenta* corporis et sanguinis Christi signis cælestibus contumeliam faciunt, ea contumelia signorum rebus signatis imputatur." (Hooper, ii., p. 498.) "The contempt of the signs is the contempt of the things signified." (Whitgift, iii., p. 383.) "'*Unworthily*' is never joined with *Christ's body*. . . . . They eat the said ONLY *sacrament* and the ONLY figure unto condemnation, making themselves, as Paul saith, 'guilty of Christ's body and blood;' which they DO NOT RECEIVE, because they *will* NOT BELIEVE." (Hutchinson, Works, p. 264.) So Bullinger: "He saith not, 'Whoso eateth the *flesh* and drinketh the *blood* un-

cause for fear, that Lutherans would gain the ascendancy.* Peter Martyr was in England, and M. Bucer and P. Fagius were expected to strengthen his hands in opposing the views of the Reformed. Cranmer was yet supposed to be a firm supporter of "the Real Presence." So also were the Bishops who acted with him.

But in a little while these fears were allayed. Peter Martyr † came boldly forward as a champion against the

worthily.' . . . . , If thou marvel how the unbelievers can be guilty of the Lord's body and blood, being eaten *but sacramentally;* learn this out of other places. . . . . Although, therefore, the wicked do not eat the Lord's very body nor drink His blood, nevertheless they are guilty of betraying the Lord's body and blood as far as in them lieth. If a rebel tread under his foot the seal or letters of the prince, etc. . . . . What marvel, then, if we hear it said, that they which do eat the Lord's bread unworthily, are guilty of the body and blood of Christ? For the bread and the mystical cup are a sacrament and seal of it." (Decades, v., pp. 466, 467. See also Bradford, i., pp. 93—100; Hooper, ii., p. 49.) The same view is expressed by Jeremy Taylor: "The wicked *receive* NOT *Christ*, but the *bare symbols* only; yet *to their hurt*, because *the offer of Christ is* REJECTED." (Vol. vi., pp. 13, 14. See also Morton on Eucharist, book v., chap. ii., sec. 4., p. 315, *sqq.*)

* See Hooper's Letter to Bullinger in Orig. Letters, P. S. Edit., i., p. 61; and Burcher's Letter to Bullinger in Orig. Letters, ii., p. 652.)

† Strype supposes the change in Martyr's views to be due to Cranmer. See Memorials of Cranmer, Book ii., Ch. xxv., p. 258. Martyr's estimation of Cranmer, and specially of his judgment in this controversy, may be seen in the following extract from Strype:—

"Peter Martyr in the year following this, printed a book of the sacrament, which was the sum of what he had read before upon that point in the University of Oxford. Which book he dedicated to his patron, the Archbishop of Canterbury: and, giving the reason why he made the dedication to him, said, 'That he knew certainly, that Cranmer had so great skill in this controversy, as one could hardly

"Ubiquitarians." Cranmer * publicly declared and most ably maintained his changed views. The other suspected Bishops

find in any one besides. That *there was* NONE *of the Fathers, which he had not* DILIGENTLY NOTED; *no antient or modern book extant, that he* (Martyr) had not with his own eyes seen noted by the Archbishop's hand. WHATSOEVER BELONGED TO THE WHOLE CONTROVERSY, he said, that the Archbishop had digested into particular chapters, councils, canons, popes, decrees, pertaining hereunto: and that with so great labour, that unless he had been an eye-witness of it and seen it, he could not easily have believed others, if they had told him, in regard of the *infinite toil, diligence, and exactness*, wherewith the Archbishop had done it.' He added, 'that the Archbishop had not bestowed *such kind of pains and study in the matter of the sacrament only*, but that he had done the same thing, as to *all other doctrines*, in effect, which in that age were *especially under controversy*. And this that learned man said, he had made good observation of. Nor, as he went on, that he wanted skill, a method and industry in defending what he held. Which might, he said, be known by this, because he had so often conflicted with his adversaries, both publicly and privately, and by a marvellous strength of learning, quickness of wit, and dexterity of management, had asserted what he held to be true, from the thorny and intricate cavils of sophisters (glancing at his controversies with Winchester, who was commonly then called the Sophister), and that he wanted not a will, yea, a mind ready to defend sound and Christian doctrines. That all men did sufficiently understand, who *saw him burn with so great an endeavour of restoring religion*, that for THIS CAUSE ONLY HE HAD GREAT AND HEAVY ENEMIES, and neglected many commodities of this life, and underwent horrible dangers.' The great and intimate converse that Peter Martyr had with Cranmer, gave him opportunity to know him very well: and therefore I have chosen to set down this character that he gave of him, and particularly of his ability in this controversy of the Eucharist." (Strype's Cranmer, Book ii., Ch. xxv., pp. 257, 258.) Cranmer's opinion of Martyr may be seen in Strype's Annals, Vol. i., Ch. xxv., p. 288.

* Strype says, (Cranmer, book ii., chap. xxv., p. 263.) "Thus God made use of the Archbishop [Cranmer], who was once one of

were found ranging themselves on the same side. Bucer's resolute Protestantism, no doubt, made its influence felt; but the suggestions of his *modified Lutheranism* seem to have been *carefully eschewed.**

We need not wonder, therefore, that Traheron should be found writing to Bullinger (Dec. 1548): "The Archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly,†

the MOST VIOLENT ASSERTERS of the corporal presence to be the CHIEFEST INSTRUMENT of overthrowing it." (See Cranmer's letter to Joachim Vadian, 1537, in Orig. Letters, P. S. Edit., i., pp. 13, 14; and J. H. Blunt's Reformation, Rivington's, p. 537; also Hook's Lives of the Archbishops. Series ii., vol. ii., pp. 60, 61.)

* See Dr. Blakeney's "Book of Common Prayer," pp. 74—80; especially p. 79; and Canon Estcourt's Dogmatic Teaching of the Common Prayer, p. 44.

† So also John-ab-Ulmis to Bullinger (Nov. 1548; Orig. Letters, ii., p. 383): "The bishops entertain *right* and *excellent* opinions respecting the holy Supper of Jesus Christ. That abominable error and silly opinion of a carnal eating has been long since *banished* and entirely *done away with*. Even that Thomas [Cranmer] himself, about whom I wrote to you when I was in London, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man, Master John a Lasco, is in a measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy." And again the same to Bullinger (March, 1549; Orig. Letters, ii., p. 388): "As to what they have reported respecting religion, namely, that there are great differences of opinion, I admit that such *has been* the case to a considerable extent; but I can *now* assert that by the goodness of God the minds of ALL *good men* are disposed to harmony and peace. For the cause of these dissensions is removed in this present parliament; namely, the babbling and dogmas of Antichrist, which are now positively and effectually *banished*. I would here write you word what has been done and determined respecting the Lord's Supper. . . . . The Archbishop of Canterbury, a man of singular worth and learning, has, contrary to the general expectation, delivered his opinion upon this subject learnedly, correctly, orderly,

firmly, and learnedly maintained your opinion on this subject. I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters have altogether come over to our side." (Original Letters, P. S. Edit., i., p. 323.) Nor that Ridley should speak, both in his writings* and in his Conference† with

and clearly: and by the weight of his character, and the dignity of his language and sentiments, easily drew over *all his hearers to* OUR *way of thinking*. . . . . Peter Martyr has openly declared to us all, on this very day on which I write this letter, what was his opinion upon this subject; and he seemed to all of us not to depart even a nail's breadth from that entertained by yourself. Nay, more, he has defended that most worthy man, Zuingle, by the testimony of your opinion, and taken part with him against his adversaries, who falsely object to him that he makes the sacrament a mere sign: he moreover declares that those persons are *out of their senses*, who make the *body of Christ* to be without any *local* habitation, *uncircumscribed*, in *many places at once*, void of shape, and other matters of the like kind." See also Peter Martyr to Bullinger (April, 1551; Orig. Letters, ii., p. 493), and the same to Bullinger (Jan. 1550; Orig. Letters, ii., pp. 478—480); also Hooper to Bullinger (Dec. 1549; Orig. Letters, i., p. 71), and the same (Feb. 1550; Orig. Letters, i., pp. 76, 77). Traheron also writes to Bullinger (Sept. 1548): "That you may add yet more to the praises of God, you must know that Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops, who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans." (Orig. Letters, i., p. 322 See also Hardwick on Articles, p. 126.)

* "The former proposition (*confessed of* ALL that be named to be learned, so far as I do know *in England*), which is, that there is *but* ONE *material substance* in the sacrament of the body, and *one* ONLY likewise in the sacrament of the blood." (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 12.)

† The Conference "was penned" with Ridley's "own hand." He says (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 160): "'As for Melancthon,' quoth I, 'whom Mr. Fecknam spake of, I marvel that ye will allege him; for

Bourne after being committed to the Tower, as if in England ALL learned men were AGREED in opposition to the views of Melancthon and the Lutherans.

Those whose views incline towards the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist are in the habit of lamenting the influence which our English refugees brought with them, on the accession of Elizabeth, from the Continent. They regard them as having acquired an unhappy tendency from their intercourse with and affection towards foreign divines. But, in truth, it may well be questioned whether the religious tendencies of our Reformers (in the matter, at least, of Eucharistic doctrine) were not much rather the cause than the effect of this friendship. There were Lutheran theologians on the Continent as well as those of the opposite school. Why did our Reformers associate almost only with the latter? Why did they not become equally influenced by men of strong Lutheran tendencies? The answer is

we are more nigh an agreement here in England, than the opinion of Melancthon to you: for in *this point we* ALL AGREE HERE, that there is in the sacrament *but* ONE *material substance;* and Melancthon, as I ween, saith *there are* TWO.' 'Ye say truth,' quoth Mr. Secretary: 'Melancthon's opinion is so.'"

It may be worth while, perhaps, to add, that in the later years of his life Melancthon's views underwent very considerable and important modifications, so that he became, in Luther's view, "almost of Zwinglian opinions," and that (while extreme Lutheranism was leading some to maintain the true and proper *ubiquity* of Christ's body: not only that it *may*, while still in heaven, be present *anywhere*, but that it actually *is* present *everywhere*) Luther himself is recorded to have said to Melancthon on his death-bed: "Dear Philip, I confess to have gone too far in the affair of the sacrament." (See Encycl. Brittan. 8th Edit., Art. "Luther" at end.)

surely not far to seek. It is contained in this simple fact,* that the Lutherans had no welcome for our English exiles. Why was it that our English divines found so warm a welcome among the Reformed, and no such reception among Lutherans? Simply because they were known to have taken their sides before. In a word, they went out with warm sympathies—sympathies which had already created friendships—towards the one, and with views decidedly opposed to the other.

Again, on the accession of Elizabeth (when, doubtless, the Lutheran party, strengthened in Mary's reign, had become considerable),† overtures proceeded from the English Court, with the idea of joining the great Lutheran (or Schmalkaldic) league; and negotiations on the subject of this union were continued eagerly for a while. Here was fresh cause for alarm to the Reformed party. And Bullinger wrote: "I see no small disturbances like to arise in England also, if the Augustan Confession be received, which some would have; a thing very unworthy in many regards. . . . .

* The statement of Neal is worth remarking: "Many escaped the fury of the persecution, by withdrawing from the storm, and flying into foreign countries. . . . But the uncharitableness of the Lutherans on this occasion was very remarkable; they hated the exiles *because they were sacramentarians*, and when any English came among them for shelter, they *expelled them* their cities; so that they *found little hospitality* in Saxony and other places of Germany where Lutheranism was professed. Philip Melancthon interceded with the Senate on their behalf, but the clergy were so *zealous for their consubstantiation*, that they irritated the magistrates everywhere against them." (History of Puritans, vol. i., p. 76. See Strype. Cranmer, book iii., chap. xv., Ann. 1554, pp. 353, 354; Edit. 1694.)

† See Soames's Elizabethan History, pp. 15, 16; Hardwick on Articles, p. 126.

Beware, and lay to your helping hand, that it be not received. *King Edward's reformation satisfieth the godly.*" (See Strype's Annals, chap. ii., p. 53, and Zurich Letters, ii., 17.) The Augustan Confession (*i.e.* the Confession of Augsburg) was *not* received. The negotiations were broken off. And Grindal wrote to Zanchius: "When first her highness Elizabeth, under most auspices, began her reign, the Popish doctrine and worship being cast off, she restored all things to *that standard* of the administration of the Word of God, and the sacraments, and whole of religion, which had been drawn up and established during the reign of Edward VI. of happy, but also of lamented memory." (Remains, pp. 338, 339.)

The Reformed party regained a full and complete ascendancy. And we find Jewel writing to Peter Martyr (Nov. 1560; Zurich Letters, i., pp. 92, 93): "Our Church, by the blessing of God, is at length in peace. . . . . That volatile Ubiquitarian doctrine cannot by any means gain footing among us." And again he writes to the same (in Feb. 1562; Zurich Letters, i., p. 100): "As to your statement that a kind of *interim* and farrago of religion is aimed at by some parties, may God prevent it! . . . . . As to matters of *doctrine*, we have pared away *everything* to the *very quick*, and do *not differ* from *your doctrine by a nail's breadth;* for as to the Ubiquitarian theory, there is no *danger in* THIS COUNTRY."

To the same effect Bishop Horn writes to Bullinger (in 1563; Zurich Letters, i., p. 135): "We have throughout England the *same ecclesiastical doctrine* as yourselves." And again (Ibid): "Of the books you mention in your second letter, I have received three upon the same arguments, against the Ubiquitarianism of Brentius, which subject a certain Englishman has undertaken as you desire . . . .

that it may be manifest to every one, that the people of England entertain on these points *the same opinions* as you do at Zurich." To the same effect Bishop Parkhurst writes to Josiah Simler (Feb. 1574; Zurich Letters, i., p. 302): "So far are we English from defending either the Ubiquitarian or any other monstrous opinions, that *we cannot endure them*. We *only dispute* about *ceremonies and habits*, and things of *no importance*." And to the same effect also Bishop Grindal writes to Bullinger (Aug. 27, 1566; Zurich Letters, i., p. 169):* "The pure doctrine of the Gospel remained in all its integrity and freedom; in which, even to this day, (notwithstanding the attempts of many to the contrary,) we MOST FULLY agree *with your Churches, and with the confession you have lately set forth*."†

* See also Bishop Cox's Letter to R. Gualter (July, 1574; Zurich Letters, i., p. 307).

† *i.e.* the Helvetic Confession (1566), in which it is declared: "Qui *nulla cum fide* at hanc sacram Domini mensam accedit, sacramento duntaxat communicat, et *rem sacramenti*, unde est vita et salus, *non percipit*." And again: "Ergo corpus Domini et sanguinem ejus cum pane et vino non ita conjungimus, ut panem ipsum dicamus esse corpus Christi, nisi *ratione sacramentali*, aut *sub pane* corporaliter latitare corpus Christi: ut etiam *sub speciebus panis adorari debeat*, aut quicunque *signum* percipiat, idem et *rem* percipiat ipsam. Corpus Christi in cœlis est, ad dextram Patris." ("Sylloge Confessionum," pp. 85, 86. See Hall's Harmony of Confessions, p. 319. See also Strype's Annals, vol. i., chap. xlviii., p. 524.)

PAPERS

ON THE

EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

No. IV.

BOOKS OF SANCTION.

We are now about to pass from the opinions of individual Reformers, to writings which may be regarded as having had given them more or less of the character of sanctioned or authoritative books and documents of the English Reformed Church.

This seems, therefore, to be the proper place for giving a reason, for what may be regarded as a strange and unnatural (perhaps even an unfair) course of proceeding—the fixing our attention *first* on the views of individuals, and ascending step by step, till we reach at *last* the writings of the highest symbolical authority in our Church.

No doubt the opposite course, would have been, in many ways, preferable. Yet, there *is* a reason for not adopting it; and a reason, which, when stated, will, I hope, remove all impression of unfairness, and will commend itself to the minds of those who are really desirous of seeing their way clear to forming a fair judgment, and giving a true verdict on the question before us.

I am not wishing to impute anything to the motives of those who differ from me, when I say, that it seems to me to make a very important difference in the view of our

Formularies, whether we approach them through the language of modern writers on this subject, or through the language of the Reformers, under whose auspices they were compiled or reformed.

And, this being so, I must be allowed to regard it, as, not only *not unfair*, but only *fair* and *right* that we should draw near to examine them through the language of that Theology, to which they may be said to belong.

But here let me not be misunderstood. I would not ask my readers to gather from my Extracts the views of our Reformers, and then take these views with them that they may put them into, and fasten them on to, our Liturgy and Articles. Against such a proceeding, I desire most earnestly to caution every one. It does not follow, that the views (however distinct and definite) of individuals (however numerous and influential) should have been of necessity, stamped definitely on the authoritative expositions of our Church's teaching. It would be *most unfair*, to assume that all the opinions of our Reformers must be clearly stamped on our Prayer Book. It would be most unjustifiable to import all the opinions of our Reformers into statements on the same subjects in our Articles. Of course my readers cannot but form their own opinions of the *probability* or *possibility* of our Reformers, with such distinctly expressed opinions, authorizing formularies which should speak either a contrary, or a different, or a doubtful language, on such a subject as that before us.

But the testimony of our formularies is a testimony which is to speak for itself. Their own voice is to be heard. What they say *for themselves* is what we are concerned with. We may not seek to make our symbolical books *mean* more than they *say*, because we may have learnt to know that

such an added meaning would only be in accord with the expressed opinions of our Reformers.

It is not for this that I have adopted the course I am defending. It will not, I hope, lead to this, that my previous papers have been filled with Extracts from our Reforming Divines.

My desire is not to sanction senses *imported into* our Formularies but to protect our Formularies from having their true natural meaning cast away, or exchanged for something new and not their own.

Our Articles have a meaning, and that meaning, I conceive, we are bound sacredly to guard. We may not make them mean more than they say. We must not allow them to mean less than in the right interpretation of their language, they clearly *do* say. We must keep watch against the error which would *force* a sense *into* them. But we are bound also to guard them from any force which would rob them of that which in fairness and truth belongs to them.

To aim at such a defence of their sense is, I am persuaded, to aim at doing that which is true and just in our dealings with our Formularies, and with our Reformers from whom we inherit them.

And it is with a view to this, and only this, that I have chosen to approach from lower ground upwards to the Articles of our Church.

If distance of time has made in the language of our Formularies anything which *was clear* to be now at all *doubtful* or anyways *indistinct*, then to look at our Formularies through the language of the Reformation as through a glass, is to use the language of our Reformers only as men use a telescope to remove the obscurities of distance, that they may see things only in their true form and colour,

that those things may appear to them as without a glass they would appear if they were nearer. It is not at all to do as *they* do, who would look at objects through such a glass as will colour or distort whatever is seen through it. I only claim for the sense of our Formularies that it should not be regarded as variable, and shifting, like a quicksand, by the force of the tides and currents and under currents of rising or falling theolgical systems.

I only claim for them, that what they clearly and distinctly meant at the time of their settlement, they ought clearly and distinctly to mean *now*—that what doctrines they were felt plainly to exclude *then*, they ought to be seen plainly to exclude *now*—that what opinions they certainly *had* stamped with an unmistakeable character *then*, they ought to be regarded as having those same opinions firmly impressed on them still.

I mean that our Formularies may not be regarded as things to be tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of human opinion, but must be understood as having some sense, definite and determined; and that that sense we are called upon to uphold unchanged, and to defend at all costs.

And, if this be so indeed, then I contend, that if, and so far as, theological language may have varied in the course of three centuries; if, and so far as, expressions once plain, may have become ambiguous; if, and so far as, language which was exclusive then, may be thought to be inclusive now; if, and so far as, words which may have spoken distinctly the language of one side of the controversy then, may be thought capable of a different meaning now;—it is no more untrue, or unjust, or unfair, to read these in the light of the theological language of the time, than it would be if they had been written in a language now dead, to translate

them into our vernacular, or if they contained words now altogether changed in their meanings, to look into an old English dictionary for the true sense they should bear.

Ridley used the word *worship* in a sense we should none of us think of giving to it now. We are not to make Ridley talk nonsense, by forcing the modern meaning of the word into his sayings. And as little, I contend, may we take any modern senses or explanations, or glosses, to mould into shape, to add to or to deduct from, whatsoever may have been originally distinct and clear and obvious in the sense of our Formularies, as they would have been naturally understood in the theological language of their time.

Such then, is the use—the only use—I wish to make of the writings of our Reformers* as we approach the inspection of our authorized Formularies, with reference to the question, "Do they or do they not teach the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence?"

But it must not, of course, be supposed that because I disclaim any further use of our Reformers' writings for this purpose, therefore I am prepared to lay down, or mean to put aside, the positive bearing on the question before us, of the cumulative evidence afforded by the unvarying testimony of all our Reformers. If it be so, that our Reformers have, as with one voice, rejected and repudiated the doctrine in question, what *shall* we, (as many of us as have learnt to thank God for the Reformation of the English Church,) what *can* we, think of a system† which would teach us to

* That is, for purposes of interpretation. They will be brought forward also as historical evidence, for the purpose of removing objections to the natural meaning of some of our Formularies.

† A system, be it observed, very different, indeed, from Lutheranism. The high Lutheran doctrine, indeed, on the Presence (viewed alone) was the same; but it was adhering to a system, to which it may be

cast overboard our Reformers and the doctrines they held so sacred and precious, and left us to hold sacred and precious too; which would teach us that in those doctrines is a denial of what we ought to hold—not as an opinion only, but as *de fide*, which would then bid us put the helm to, that we might steer our ship back again to the very harbour from which our Reformers set sail, as from a plague-infected land, and this, that we may take on board again the very wares and merchandise, the very same poisonous doctrines of which our Reformers lightened our ship, some of them at the cost of their lives?

There are, indeed, those who professedly regard our Reformers and the Reformation with feelings of deep repugnance.

The position of such, as ministers of the Reformed Church of England, is one which may safely be left to set itself to rights.

We have nothing to do in these papers with strong language, and indignant declamation; and I believe it needs nothing but the good common sense of Englishmen to make it felt that, with whatever good intention it may be attempted, such a position is too anomalous to be permanently maintained.

said to have been strongly repugnant, and which always kept it, more or less straitly, on every side, in bonds. Insomuch that Waterland says, "The Lutherans, when pressed to speak plainly, deny every article almost which they are commonly charged with by their adversaries." (See "Doctrine of Eucharist," vol. iv., ch. viii., p. 640.) How different is the position of this doctrine in a system which incorporates the "Real Objective Presence" into itself, so as to form a congruous whole, and, receiving strength from it, adds also power and energy to it, and gives it free course that it may carry its adherents on to the utmost bounds of (so-called) Catholic Doctrine!

We desire, I trust from our hearts, for such persons nothing worse than that they may learn to prize the Reformation as a blessed work of God, however frail and sinful may have been some of the instruments employed.*

We have for our opponents not these—but those who (agreeing in doctrine with them) yet believe and maintain that they are teaching the doctrines taught by our Church,

* None were more sensible of the evils which accompanied the Reformation than some of the Reformers themselves. Neale, doubtless, is but recording the truth when he writes, "Nor were the lives of many who were zealous for the Reformation free from scandal; the courtiers and great men indulged themselves in a dissolute and licentious life; and the clergy were not without blemishes. Some that embraced the Reformation, were far from adorning their profession, but rather disposed the people to return to their old superstitions: nevertheless, there were many great and shining lights among them, who preached and prayed fervently against the corruption of the times, and were an example to their flocks, by the strictness of their lives and manners; but their numbers were small in comparison to the many that were otherwise, turning the doctrines of grace into lasciviousness." (History of Puritans, i. p. 54.) "Dr. Littledale bids his readers to liken the English Reformers to those false and villainous prophets, Ahab and Zedekiah, whom the King of Babylon roasted in the fire. (Jer. xxix. 22.) For their own sakes, I would beseech men to ponder long and seriously before they incur so grave and solemn a responsibility. That Cranmer cannot, in strictness, be reckoned as a martyr, we may be ready, with Dean Hook, to admit: but the same arguments do not apply to the cases of Rogers, Saunders, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, and many more.

So long as it is granted, as it is by Lingard and all fair historians, that these men might have saved their lives by the admission of certain current doctrines respecting the Holy Eucharist and the Papal Supremacy, so long must it be reckoned, I would maintain, a decision contrary to all truth and charity, to say, with Dr. Littledale, that 'they were burnt for their crimes.'" (J. G. Cazenove's "Aspects of the Reformation," pages 191, 192. See "Principles at Stake," pp. 15 sqq.)

and sanctioned by our Reformation, and upheld by at least one class—the better class—of our Reformers; and our object is to show that as to the doctrines of the Real Objective Presence, it was utterly *repudiated* by *our Reformers*, and is *excluded* by the teaching of our Formularies as fairly and truly interpreted. Its repudiation by our Reformers has, I believe, been shewn by their own witness, as alleged in previous papers. Its exclusion by our Formularies, understood in their plain, obvious, natural sense, with a fair light fairly thrown upon them by the theological language of the Reformation, will I trust be shewn in future papers. Meanwhile we have first to review certain works which may be said either (at certain times) to have received some sanction, or something like sanction, or to be of some lesser authority, or quasi-authority, in the English Church, that after their measure they may add somewhat to the weight of testimony which bears witness to the rejection of the doctrine before us.

I.

Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.

The following is a part of Strype's account of the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.

"In this parliament [Anno. 1571, Eliz. 13] was the last effort I think, made to bring into practice in this realm, by authority of parliament, a body of ecclesiastical and civil laws, that had been carefully framed by Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Goodrick, Dr. Cox now Bishop of Ely,

Dr. May afterwards elect of York, Dr. Peter Martyr, Dr. Rowland Taylour afterwards a holy martyr, and some other civilians and common lawyers: and the rubbish of the Popish canons and constitutions being laid aside, this, as a just and complete codex, to be used in the room thereof. Acts of Parliament were passed for this end, both in the time of King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI. The work was closely plied and finished by the foresaid learned and excellent men under King Edward, and put into very elegant Latin by the pens of Dr. Haddon and Sir John Cheke, and had certainly been ratified had God spared that King's life till another parliament. Such a body of laws to succeed the old ones had been many years desired by the learnedest and best men of the reformed religion. And now in the present parliament, so active for the reforming of religion, it was moved, as was thought, seasonably. And care was taken to have it printed against the sitting of the parliament; which was done by John Fox from two original MS. copies; the former Archbishop Cranmer's own book (which afterwards fell into Fox's possession) wherein was much of his own hand, as likewise of Peter Martyr's and other the assistants; the other a copy belonging to Archbishop Parker. Who, I verily believe, employed* and encouraged Fox in preparing this book for the press. And that he made use of our Archbishop's copy, appears by what Fox wrote in his own on the head of the

* In this Strype may probably be in error. (See Cardwell's note in Preface, pp. x., xi.)

page that contains the titles of the whole following book, *viz.*, *Ordo Titulorum in Cod. D.* Matth. *Cant.*, placing those titles according to the said Archbishop's copy communicated to him." (Strype's Parker, Book iv., ch. 5, pp. 323, 4. Edit. 1711.)

This book never became law, through the Queen's dislike of parliamentary interference with ecclesiastical matters, and something, it appears, of aversion to the individuals by whom the measure was recommended,* not without, perhaps, some dislike of some things in the book itself.

Foxe's edition, however, was published in 1571. This Edition, no doubt, was printed from the MS. of Archbishop Parker. And of this MS. it has been said that it "contained the whole code as revised and approved by Archbishop Parker, was made public with the Archbishop's consent in the same year, when the XXXIX. Articles of Religion were finally subscribed by Convocation and ratified by parliament, and represents the state and condition of the Church of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when the Reformation may be said to have been completed."†

The following Extracts are taken from Dr. Cardwell's Oxford Edition of 1850.

I.

From "De Hæresibus," cap. 5. "*De duabus naturis Christi.*"

". . . Illi delirium imitantur, qui corpori Christi tam

* See Cardwell's Preface, p. xii.

† Ibid, pp. x. xi. The only "sanction" claimed for the "Reformatio Legum," is that which arises from the fact of its having been twice so nearly made authoritative, and having been designed and prepared for

latos fines dant, ut illo credant aut *omnes locos* simul, aut *innumeros* obsideri. Quod si confiteremur, humanam e Christo naturam eximeremus. Qui errores . . . sacrarum Scripturarum authoritate sic corrigendi sunt, ut Christus. . . . corpus habeat . . . quemadmodum *reliqua humana corpora* suis loci finibus circumscriptum." (Page 10.)

II.

From "De Hæresibus," Cap. 19. "*De transubstantione in Eucharistia, et impanatione, ut vocant, Corporis Christi.*"

"Itaque nec *in altum* tolli sacramentum hoc, nec circumferri per agros patimur, nec *conservari* in Crastinum, nec *adorari;* denique nullum relinquimus majorem Eucharistiæ venerationem, quam baptismi et verbi Dei. Symbola vero panis et vini *nisi pium* et *institutum* a Scripturis *usum communicationis* retineat, non *majorem æstimationem* habere volumus, quam panis et vinum habent, quæ quotidie inter nos in usu habentur. In eodem luto hærent, qui panis et vini substantiam in Eucharistia ponunt sed *vi consecrationis per ministrum appositæ* CORPUS ET SANGUINEM CHRISTI *verum*

authorization by men whose names of esteem and reverence in the English Church may be said to give some sort of sanction to a work prepared and revised under such auspices for such a purpose. It gives *some* evidence, at least, of the doctrine on this subject which, in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, our ecclesiastical authorities desired and designed to sanction and authorize. Thus regarded, it is not, I trust, unsuitably placed here, that its statements may add somewhat to the testimony of those other books which may be more strictly regarded as having more or less of a quasi-authoritative character.

et naturalem ADJUNGI *putant*, et cum symbolorum naturis permisceri, et SUBTER EAS SUBJICI, *usque adeo ut sive pii sint sive impii*, qui ad Domini mensam se admovent, verum et naturale Christi corpus, et expressum ejus sanguinem, *una cum pane et vino sumant*. Verum symbola sacramentorum quoniam RES QUAS SIGNIFICANT, NON *intra se* CLAUSAS *realiter et substantialiter* (ut loquuntur) CONTINENT; deinde cum sacris Scripturis determinatum sit, Christum suam in cælum *humanam naturam* invexisse, nec *cum illa* sit in terras ante tempus extremi judicii descensurus; præteara cum hoc commentitia naturalis corporis Christi præsentia nullum habeat majus momentum ad ædificationem nostræ religionis quam hæc Christi præsentia quæ fide percipitur, imo multas secum afferat quæstiones inexplicabiles, ac assertiones falsas et portentosas: ABSURDAM HANC DOCTRINAM *qua Christi corpus et sanguis naturaliter et substantialiter* (ut illi loquuntur) *ad Eucharistiam adrepunt, et in eam includuntur*, PRORSUS ABOLERI VOLUMUS. Peregrinum enim est, et alienum a sacris literis; deinde *contrarium humanæ naturæ* VERITATI, quam Christus assumpsit, et a conditione sacramentorum longe dissidens; postremo communis quædam sentina superstitionum multarum in Ecclesiam Dei comportatarum." (Pages 19, 20.)

III.

From "De Sacramentis," cap. 4. "*Quid sit Eucharistia quos fructus habeat.*"

"Eucharistia sacramentum est, in quo cibum ex pane sumunt, et potum ex vino, qui convivæ sedant in sacra

Domini mensa: cujus panis inter illos et vini communicatione obsignatur gratia Spiritus Sancti, veniaque peccatorum, ad quam ex eo perveniunt, quod *fide comprehendunt* et *percipiunt Christi sacrosanctum corpus respectu nostræ salutis ad crucem fixum, et cruorem pro tollendis fusum nostris peccatis*, ut Dei promissa palam ipsa loquuntur." (Page 31.)

IV.

From the same.

"Cum autem ad hæc omnia nec transubtantiatione opuis sit, *nec illa quam fingere solebant* REALI PRÆSENTIA CORPORIS CHRISTI, sed potius hæc curiosa hominum inventa primum CONTRA NATURAM HUMANAM sint a Filio Dei nostra causa SUMPTAM, deinde *cum Scripturis divinis pugnent*, et præterea cum universa sacramentorum ratione confligant, *ista tanquam* FRIVOLA *quædam* SOMNIA *merito* DESECANDA CURAVIMUS *et oblivione obruenda, præsertim cum* MAGNUM *ex* ILLIS *et* PERNICIOUSUM AGMEN *superstitionum in Eccelesia Dei importatum fuerit.* (Pages 31, 32.)

V.

From "De Hæresibus," cap. 10. *"De missis et purgatorio."*

"Quorundam nimis est curiosa perversitas, qui veniam quidem peccatorum expectant, sed hanc morte Christi per solam fidem ad nos accommodatam plane non credunt et omnibus partibus impleri. Quapropter alia conquirunt sacrificia, quibus perpurgari possint, et ad hanc rem missas exhibent in quibus sacrificium Deo Patri credunt oblatum esse, nimirum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu

Christi *vere*, quomodoque illi dicunt *realiter*, ad veniam peccatorum impetrandam, et salutem tam morturoum quam vivorum procurandam.

". . . Qua in re sacrificium illud unicum . . . largiter imminuunt, et *sacerdotium* quod *unius Christi proprium* est, ad miserabilem hominum conditionem devolvunt." (Pages 12, 13.)

II.

The Catechism of Edward VI., .a.d 1553.

The Catechism of Edward VI. was authoritatively set forth for the use of all schoolmasters throughout England, by letters patent and injunction of His Majesty King Edward VI., bearing date May 1553. It is generally attributed to Dr. Ponet (or Poynet,) Bishop of Winchester, and was duly examined and approved by certain bishops, and other learned men, among whom were Cranmer,*

* The consent and approval of Cranmer and Ridley is evident from the following conversation in Ridley's disputation at Oxford. They are quoted in Dr. Blakeney's Book of Common Prayer, p. 88:—

Ridley:—I grant that I saw the book, but I deny that I wrote it. I perused it after it was made, and I noted many things for it, so I consented to the book. I was not the author of it. *Judges*:—The Catechism is so set forth as though the whole Convocation house had agreed to it. Cranmer said yesterday that you made it. *Ridley*:—I think surely that he would not say so. *Ward*:—The Catechism hath this clause, Si visibiliter et in terra, if visibly and on the earth. *Ridley*:—I answer, that these articles were set out, I both writing and consenting to them, mine own hand will testify the same, and Master Cranmer put his hand to them likewise, and gave them to others afterwards." (Ridley's Works, P.S. Edit., p. 227.)

Ridley and others. It is especially worthy of notice as having been, in the words of Bishop Randolph, "the last work of the Reformers in that reign: whence it may fairly be understood to contain, as far as it goes, their ultimate decision; and to represent the sense of the Church of England as then established." Under Queen Mary it was suppressed* and burnt, and was "the Catechismus Reprobatus" of her first Convocation. Copies of it are now very rare. Archbishop Wake, says, "in this the complete model of our Church Catechism was laid."† The title is "A Short Catechism; or, Plain Instruction, containing the Sum of Christian Learning, set forth by the King's Majesty's authority, for all schoolmasters to teach." The Latin and English versions are given in the vol. of the Parker Society containing the Liturgies of Edward VI.

The following quotations are taken from an edition published by Whittaker in 1857 :—

* "On Friday, the 20th of October, [1553] Weston, the prolocutor, presented to the house two bills, which had already obtained his own signature; in the one of which, treating of *the Catechism*, [of Edward VI.] that formulary was described as *pestiferous and full of heresies*—as having been foisted upon the last synod fraudulently; and, therefore, that the present synod disowned it. It was for his firm refusal to sign the document which branded a catechism that had both truth and synodal authority on its side, quite as much as for his resistance to transubstantiation and the mass, that Philpot, at the close of this convocation, was visited with the severe penalties which lighted upon his head." (Biographical Notice of Philpot in P.S. Edit., p. xiii.)

The "synodal authority," however, may be regarded, perhaps, as somewhat doubtful. (See Burnet's Reformation, vol. ii., p. 766. Edit. Orr. 1850; and Collier's Eccles. Hist., vol. v., p. 506; Neal's History of Puritans, vol. i., p. 51, note; Hook's Lives of the Archbishops, series ii., vol. ii., pp. 288, 290; Lamb's Historical Account of Articles, p. 8; and Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., p. 4, 5.)

† See Preface to Whittaker's Edition, 1857.

I.

"Christ is not so altogether absent from the world, as many do suppose. For albeit the *substance of His body* be *taken up from us:* yet is His Godhead perpetually present with us.... Spiritual things are not to be seen, but with the eye of the Spirit. Therefore, he that in earth will see the Godhead of Christ, let him open the eyes, not of His body, but of His mind, but of His faith; and he shall see Him present, whom eye hath not seen; he shall see Him present, and in the midst of them, wheresoever be two or three gathered together in His Name, he shall see Him present with us, even unto the end of the world. What said I? Shall he see Christ present? Yea, he shall both see and feel Him dwelling within himself, in such sort as he doth his own proper soul.... Although He be already gone up into heaven; nevertheless by His nature of Godhead, and by His Spirit, He shall always be present in His Church, even to the end of the world. Yet this *proveth not that He is* PRESENT *among us in* HIS BODY. For His Godhead hath *one property:* His manhood *another*. His manhood was create, His Godhead uncreate. His manhood is in *some* ONE *place of heaven:* His Godhead is in such sort eachwhere, that it filleth both heaven and earth. But to make this matter plainer, by a similitude or comparing of like to like: There is nothing that doth trulier, like a shadow, express Christ, than the sun; for it is a fit image of the light and brightness of Christ. The sun doth alway keep the heaven: yet do we say that it is present also in the

world; for without light there is nothing present, that is say, nothing to be seen of any man: for the sun with his light fulfilleth all things. So Christ is lifted up above all heavens, that He may be present with all, and fully furnish all things, as St. Paul doth say. But as touching the *bodily* presence of Christ here in earth (if it be lawful to place in comparison great things with small,) Christ's body is *present* to our *faith*; as the sun, when it is seen is present to the eye: the body whereof, although it do not bodily touch the eye, nor be presently with it together here in earth, yet is it present to the sight, notwithstanding so large a distance of space between. So Christ's body, which at His glorious going up was conveyed from us; which left the world, and is gone unto His Father: *is a great way* ABSENT FROM OUR MOUTH, *even then when we* RECEIVE WITH OUR MOUTH *the holy sacrament of His body and blood.* Yet is our faith in heaven, and beholdeth the Sun of Righteousness; and is presently together with Him in heaven, in such sort as the sight is in heaven with the body of the sun, or in earth the sun with the sight. And as the sun is present to all things by his light: so is Christ also in His Godhead. Yet neither can from the body the light of the sun be sundered; nor from His immortal body the Godhead of Christ. We must therefore so say, that Christ's body is in some one place of heaven, and His Godhead everywhere: that we neither of His Godhead *make a body:* nor of *His body* a God. . . . He could not be presently with all at once, unless His body were so turned into

Godhead, that He might be in *all* or in *many places* together: as Eutyches, and certain like heretics held opinion. If it so were that He might be eachwhere present with all, at one very instant time: then were He NOT MAN, but a *ghost*: neither should He have a TRUE *body*, but a *fantastical*: whereof should have sprung forth a thousand errors, all which He hath dispatched by carrying His body up whole to heaven." (Whittaker's Edition, pp. 16—20.)

II.

"*Master*:—What declareth and betokeneth the supper unto us, which we solemnly use in the remembrance of the Lord?"

"*Scholar*:—The supper (as I have showed a little before) is a certain thankful remembrance of the death of Christ: forasmuch as the bread representeth His body, betrayed to be crucified for us, the wine standeth in stead and place of His blood, plenteously shed for us. And even as by bread and wine our natural bodies are sustained and nourished, so by the body, that is, the flesh and blood of Christ, the soul is fed through faith, and quickened to the heavenly and godly life."

"*Master*:—How come these things to pass?"

"*Scholar*:—*These things come to pass by a certain secret mean and lively working of the Spirit, when we believe that Christ hath, once for all, given up His body and blood for us,* to make a sacrifice and most pleasant offering to His heavenly Father; and also when we confess and acknow-

ledge Him our only Saviour, High Bishop, Mediator and Redeemer; to whom is due all honour and glory."

"*Master*:—All this thou dost well understand. For methinketh thy meaning is: that *faith is the mouth of the soul, whereby we receive this heavenly meat*, full both of salvation and immortality, dealt among us by the means of the Holy Ghost." (Whittaker's Edition pp. 32—33.)

III.

Nowell's Catechism.

Alexander Nowell was born about 1507. He was educated at Brasen-Nose College, Oxford, of which in 1595 he was made president.

In Queen Mary's reign he was at first among the exiles at Strasburgh, and afterwards at Frankfort.

Returning to England on the accession of Elizabeth, he became Dean of St. Paul's, and was chosen to be Prolocutor in the Convocation which revised the "Articles of Religion." He died in 1602.)

The following account of his Catechism is from Bishop Jacobson's Preface to the Oxford Edition of 1835.

"The larger Catechism was prepared at the suggestion of Cecil, and was intended not only for the use of schools, but also to serve as a standing summary of the doctrines of the Church of England. Such a work, it was hoped, would silence an objection which was commonly urged by the Papists, particularly abroad, 'that the Protestants had no principles;' 'that nothing touching religion was with any authority or consent of any number of the learned here set forth, but

that a few private persons taught and writ their opinions without any authority at all.' The time at which the Catechism was drawn up, cannot be exactly ascertained. It must have been before the opening of the session of Convocation in 1562, in the course of which the thirty-nine Articles were compiled and agreed upon; for in one paper, in which the heads of business to be transacted by that Synod are noted, it is spoken of 'as well-nigh finished by the industry of the Dean of Paule's;' in another, as 'already done, and wanting only viewing.' On being submitted to the Lower House, it was so carefully examined and corrected, that 'it was by them unanimously approved and allowed as their own book and owned doctrine.' In the course of the twenty-second session it was presented to the Upper House by the author in his capacity of Prolocutor, attended by Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, and Day, Provost of Eton. The Bishops of Salisbury, Exeter, St. David's and Litchfield, were appointed to examine the Catechism, but they seem to have contended themselves with a reiterated assurance from the Lower House that they had unanimously approved of the book. After receiving some additions it was presented a second time to the Upper House, but, like the Book of Discipline* tendered to them about the same time, never received their formal sanction. From the paper containing notes of matters to be discussed in this Synod, it appears to have been originally designed to have Nowell's Catechism and Jewel's Apology

* Perhaps the "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum."

added to the Articles of the Church in one book, authorized as containing true doctrine, and enjoined to be taught to the youth in the universities and grammar schools throughout the realm. That the alterations made in the Catechism during the time that it was before Convocation were considerable and extensive, we may gather from the expressions used by Nowell in a letter which he addressed to Cecil, June 22nd, 1563, which may be seen in Strype, Annals, I. i., p. 526. The dean there states, 'whereas the copy of the Catechism which he caused to be written out for his honor, came to the hands of the bishops and clergy, assembled in the late Convocation, and by reason that certain places were by their judgments altered, and that it was interlined and somewhere blotted, he had caused it to be copied out again, and had sent it to him now, not in his own name as afore, but in the name of the clergy of the Convocation, as their book, seeing it was by them approved and allowed..... That for his part he had taken pains, as well, about the matter of the book, that it might be consonant unto the true doctrine of the Scriptures, as also that the style might agree with the purity of the Latin tongue. And that as the book had not misliked their judgments, whom he did most allow, and also reverence, so, if it might likewise be approved to him, to whose patrociny in his purpose he appointed it when he first began it, he should think his pains most happily bestowed.' Heylin and Burnett indeed seem to have considered the alterations so numerous and so important, that it could hardly be regarded any longer as Nowell's work, but

minute of Convocation to the effect that the Catechism which it was thought desirable should be set forth in Latin, was already done by the Dean of Paul's, and wanted only viewing—combined with the letter just quoted, and the details which Strype has preserved respecting the work, during the interval which elapsed between the prorogation of the Convocation on the 16th of April, 1562, and its publication in 1570, and the fact that the dedication bears his initials—are surely sufficient to shew that such expressions must have resulted either from carelessness or undue scepticism. The fresh transcript of the Catechism, of which Nowell speaks in his letter to Cecil, remained in the secretary's hands for above a year, and was then returned to the author, with some learned man's notes. It remained with Nowell till 1570, by which time the Horatian precept must have been fulfilled to the letter. The two archbishops then urged its publication, and with Cecil's express permission, the original dedication to him was altered into one addressed to the archbishops and bishops. . . . .

It was originally designed that the Catechism should have been employed in schools with the same uniformity as the grammar prescribed by authority. We have already seen, however, that no such sanction was actually given by the Convocation of 1562. In the canons agreed upon by Archbishop Parker and the bishops of his province, in April 1571, its use seems to have been enjoined with all the strictness which had at first been contemplated. . . . . The larger Catechism of Nowell stands first in a list of

books, enjoined by a statute of the University of Oxford, made in 1578, for 'the quelling and abolishing heretical pravity.' . . . . Archbishop Grindal, in the third of his statutes for the school which he founded at St. Bees, in 1583, directs, that 'the schoolmaster shall teach them the Greater as well as the Lesser Catechism, set out by authority, and no other Catechism; except publicly authorized. The canons drawn up in 1603 are absolute in enjoining the uniform use of the grammar set forth by King Henry VIII., and direct all schoolmasters to use these Catechisms on pain of suspension.'"

Dr. Blakeney says:

"In 1553, a Catechism known as Ponet's, was sanctioned by Convocation. In 1561 it was determined to improve upon it, and Dean Nowell was employed for the purpose.

"His work, commonly called 'Nowell's Catechism' was approved by Convocation in 1562, 'But,' says Procter, 'not formally sanctioned, apparently because it was treated as part of a larger design which was not realized,'—that design being to publish in one book the Articles, Nowell's Catechism, and Jewel's Apology, with public approval." (Blakeney on Book of Common Prayer, p. 568.)

There is no question that reference is made to this Catechism on the 79th canon, which says:—

"All schoolmasters shall teach in English or Latin, as the children are able to bear, the larger or shorter Catechism heretofore by public authority set forth."

The following Extracts are taken from the English Translation of Norton as given in the Parker Society's Edition.

I.

"*Master* :—Tell me how this is to be understood."

"*Scholar* :—Plainly, that Christ in His body ascended into heaven, where He had not afore been in His body, and *left the earth*, where He had afore been *in His body*. For in His nature of Godhead, which filleth all things, both He ever was in heaven and also with the same, and with His Spirit, He is alway present in earth with His Church, and shall be present to the end of the world."

"*Master* :—Then thou sayest, that there is one manner of His Godhead and another of His manhood."

"*Scholar* :—Yea, forsooth, master. For we neither make of His Godhead a body, nor of His body God; for *His manhood is a creature*, His Godhead not created. And the Holy Scriptures witness that His *manhood* was *taken up into heaven* and abideth in heaven; but His Godhead is so everywhere that it filleth both heaven and earth."

"*Master* :—But dost thou say that Christ is in any wise present with us in body?"

"*Scholar* :—If we may liken great things to small, Christ's body is so present to our faith, as the sun when we see it, is present to our eye. For no one thing subject to our senses, cometh more near to the likeness of Christ than the sun, which, though it still abide in the heaven, and therefore in very deed toucheth not the eye, yet the body of the sun is present to the sight, notwithstanding so

great a distance of place between. So the body of Christ, which by His ascending is taken up from us, and hath left the world, and hath gone to His Father, is indeed absent from our senses, yet our faith is conversant in heaven, and beholdeth that Sun of Righteousness, and is verily in presence with it there present, like as our sight is present with the body of the sun in the heaven, or as the sun is present with our sight in earth. Moreover, as the sun is with his light present to all things, so is also Christ, with His Godhead, Spirit and Power, present to all, and filleth all." (Pages 162, 163.)

II.

"*Master* :—Thou conceivest well the right understanding concerning the visible signs and outward use of the sacraments. But whereas, secondly, thou givest to the sacraments the strength and efficacy to seal and confirm God's promises in our hearts, thou seemest to assign to them the proper offices of the Holy Ghost."

"*Scholar* :—To lighten and give bright clearness to men's minds and souls, and to make their consciences quiet and in security, as they be indeed, so ought they to be accounted the proper work of the Holy Ghost alone, and to be imputed to Him, and this praise not to be transferred to any other. But this is no impediment, but that God may give to His mysteries the second place in quieting and establishing our minds and consciences, but yet so that nothing be abated from the virtue of His Spirit. Wherefore we must determine that, the *outward element hath* neither

OF ITSELF NOR IN ITSELF inclosed the force and efficacy of the sacrament, but that the same wholly floweth from the Spirit of God, as out of a spring-head, and is by the divine mysteries, which are ordained by the Lord for this end, conveyed unto us." (Ibid, p. 206, 207.)

III.

"*Master* :—Sith we be in the earth, and Christ's body in heaven, how can that be that thou sayest?"

"*Scholar* :—We must lift our souls and hearts from earth, and raise them up by faith to heaven, where Christ is."

"*Master* :—Sayest thou then the mean to receive the body and blood of Christ standeth upon faith?"

"*Scholar* :—Yea. For *when we believe that Christ died to deliver us from death, and that He rose again to procure us life, we are partakers of the redemption purchased by His death*, and of His life, and all other His good things; and with the same conjoining wherewith the head and the members are knit together, He coupleth us to Himself by secret and marvellous virtue of His Spirit, even so that we be members of His body, and be of His flesh and His bones, and do grow into one body with Him."

"*Master* :—Dost thou then, that this conjoining may be made, imagine the bread and wine to be changed into the substance of the flesh and blood of Christ?"

"*Scholar* :—There is no need to invent any such change. For both the Holy Scriptures, and the best and most ancient expositors, do teach that by baptism we are likewise the members of Christ, and are of His flesh and bones,

and do grow into one body with Him, when yet there is no such change made in the water."

"*Master* :—Go on."

"*Scholar* :—In both the sacraments the substances of the outward things are not changed; but the word of God and heavenly grace coming to them, there is such efficacy, that as by baptism we are once regenerate in Christ, and are first, as it were, joined and grafted into His body; so when we rightly receive the Lord's Supper, with the very divine nourishment of His body and blood, most full of health and immortality, given to us by the work of the Holy Ghost, and received of us *by faith, as the mouth of our soul*, we are continually fed and sustained to eternal life, growing together in them both into one body with Christ."

"*Master* :—Then Christ doth also otherwise than by His Supper only give Himself unto us, and knitteth us to Himself with most strait conjoining."

"*Scholar* :—Christ did then principally give Himself to us to be the author of our salvation, when He gave Himself to death for us, that we should not perish with deserved death. By the Gospel also He giveth Himself to the faithful, and plainly teacheth that He is that lively bread that came down from heaven to nourish their souls that believe in Him. And also in baptism, as is before said, Christ gave Himself to us effectually, for that He then made us Christians."

"*Master* :—And sayest thou that there are no less strait bands of conjoining in the Supper?"

"*Scholar*:—In theLord's Supper both that communicating which I spake of is confirmed unto us, and is also increased, for that each man is both by the words and mysteries of God, ascertained that the same belongeth to Himself, and that Christ is by a certain peculiar manner given to Him, that He may most fully and with most near conjunction enjoy Him, insomuch that not only our souls are nourished with His holy body and blood as with their proper food, but also our bodies, for that they partake of the sacraments of eternal life, have, as it were by a pledge given them, a certain hope assured them of resurrection and immortality, that at length Christ abiding in us and we again abiding in Christ, we also, by Christ abiding in us, may obtain not only everlasting life, but also the glory which His Father gave Him. In a sum I say thus: as I imagine not any gross joining, so I affirm that same secret and marvellous communicating of Christ's body in His Supper to be most near and strait, most assured, most true, and altogether most high and perfect."

"*Master:*—Of this that thou hast said of the Lord's Supper, meseems, I may gather that the same was not ordained to this end, that Christ's body should be offered in sacrifice to God the Father for sins."

"*Scholar*:—*It is* NOT *so offered.* For He, when He did institute His Supper, commanded us to *eat* His body, not to *offer* it. As for the prerogative of offering for sins, it pertaineth to Christ alone, as to Him which is the eternal Priest; which also when He died upon the cross, once

made that only and everlasting sacrifice for our salvation, and fully performed the same for ever. For us there is nothing left to do, but to take the use and benefit of that eternal sacrifice bequeathed us by the Lord Himself, which we chiefly do in the Lord's Supper."

"*Master* :—Then I perceive the holy Supper sendeth us to the death of Christ, and to His sacrifice once done upon the cross, by which alone God is appeased toward us."

"*Scholar* :—It is most true. For by bread and wine the signs is assured unto us, that as the body of Christ was once offered a sacrifice for us to reconcile us to favour with God, and His blood once shed, to wash away the spots of our sins, so now also in His Holy Supper *both are given to the faithful*, that we surely know that the reconciliation of favour pertaineth to us, and may take and receive the fruit of the redemption purchased by His death."

"*Master* :—Are then the only faithful fed with Christ's body and blood?"

"*Scholar* :—THEY ONLY. For to whom He communicateth His body, to them, as I said He communicateth also everlasting life."

"*Master* :—Why dost thou not grant that the body and blood of Christ *are included in the bread and cup*, or that the bread and wine are changed into the substance of His body and blood?"

"*Scholar* :—Because that were to bring in *doubt the* TRUTH *of Christ's body;* to do dishonour to Christ Himself; and to fill them with abhorring that receive the sacrament, if we

should imagine His body either to be enclosed in so narrow a room, or to be *in many places at once*, or His flesh to be chewed in our mouth with our teeth, and to be bitten small and eaten as other meat." (Page 213—216.)

IV.

"*Master* :—Sith then both good and bad do indifferently and in common use the sacraments, what sure and stedfast trust of consciences can be in them, which thou even now didst affirm?"

"*Scholar* :—Though the ungodly, so much as concern themselves, *do not receive the gifts of God offered in the sacraments*, but do refuse and disappoint themselves; yet the godly, which by faith seek Christ, and His grace in them, are never disapointed or defrauded of a most good conscience of mind, and most sweet comfort, by an assured hope of salvation and of perfect felicity." (Page 218.)

IV

Jewel's Apology.

Bishop Jewel's Apology is recognized in Canon 30 of the Canons of 1603, as "the Apology of the Church of England," and is quoted by Hooker (Eccl. Pol. ii. 6.) under the name of "The English Apology." Collier states, that it was approved by the Queen, and set forth with the consent of the bishops. (Eccl. Hist. ii. 479.) And Bishop Jewel himself, in his reply to Harding, says, that he had the concurrence of the whole English clergy, and that the book had the Queen's licence. It was first published in 1562, the very same year as our present Articles; and "by Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles, and four successive archbishops, the Apology was ordered to be read and

chained up in all parish churches throughout England and Wales" (Watt under the name "Jewel.") And of this work and Nowell's Catechism, Bishop Randolph thus speaks in the Preface to his Enchiridion. "My choice has been principally directed to such works as had the sanction of public authority, and which may, therefore, be relied on as containing the final and decided opinions of our Reformers, approved of in the general by the Church at large. . . . . Of this kind, that is, thus publicly received, were Jewel's Apology and Nowell's Catechism, the former of which is said to have been published with the consent of the bishops, and was always understood to speak the sense of the whole Church, in whose name it is written; the latter had the express sanction of Convocation. . . . . Both these works were publicly received and allowed.*"

The following Extracts are taken from Lady Bacon's Translation, as given in the Parker Society's Edition :—

I.

"And, although the Majesty and Godhead of Christ be everywhere abundantly dispersed, yet we believe that *his* BODY as St. Augustine saith, 'must needs be still in ONE PLACE;' and that Christ hath given majesty unto His body, but yet hath not taken away from it the NATURE *of a body*, and what we must not so affirm Christ to be God, that we

* See Goode on Eucharist (p. 727-8,) from whom this account is taken. Strype says of the Apology that it "was approved by the allowance and authority of the Queen, and published by the consent of the bishops and others. . . . . It was written upon a state occasion by the common advice and consultation, no doubt, of the College of Divines that were met about Reformation of the Church," (Annals, vol. i., ch. 25, Anno 1562, pp. 284, 285, Edit. 1725. See also Heylin's History of Reformation, E. H. S. Edit., pp. 385—387.)

deny Him to be man; and as the martyr Vigilius saith, that 'Christ hath LEFT *us* as touching His *human nature*, but hath NOT LEFT us as touching His *divine nature*,' and that the same Christ, though He be ABSENT from us concerning His MANHOOD, yet is ever present with us concerning His Godhead." (Page 59.)

II.

"And those sacraments, together with Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Hierome, Chrysostom, Basil, Dionysius, and other Catholic fathers, do we call figures, signs, marks or badges, prints, copies, forms, seals, signets, similitudes, patterns, representations, remembrances, and memories. And we make no doubt, together with the same doctors, to say, that those be certain visible words, seals of righteousness, tokens of grace; and do expressly pronounce that in the Lord's Supper there is truly given unto the *believing* the body and blood of the Lord, the flesh of the Son of God, which quickeneth our souls, the meat that cometh from above, the food of immortality, grace, truth, and life; and the supper to be the communion of the body and blood of Christ; by the partaking whereof we be revived, we be strengthened, and be fed unto immortality; and whereby we are joined, united, and incorporate unto Christ, that we may abide in Him, and He in us. . . . . We say that Eucharistia, the Supper of the Lord, is a *sacrament*, that is to wit, *an evident token* of the body and blood of Christ, wherein is set, as it were, before our eyes, the death

of Christ, and His resurrection, and what act soever He did whilst He was in His mortal body; to the end we may give Him thanks for His death, and for our deliverance; and that, by the often receiving of this sacrament, we may daily renew the remembrance of that matter, to the intent we being fed with the body and blood of Christ, may be brought into the hope of the resurrection and everlasting life, and may most assuredly believe that the body and blood of Christ doth in like manner feed our souls, as bread and wine doth feed our bodies. To this banquet we think the people of God ought to be earnestly bidden, that they may all communicate among themselves, and openly declare and testify both the godly society which is among them, and also the hope which they have in Christ Jesus." (Page 62, 63.)

III.

"We affirm that bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the body and blood of Christ, and that by them Christ Himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us, as that *by faith* we verily receive His body and His blood. . . . . For we affirm that Christ doth truly and presently give His own self, in His sacraments, in baptism, that we may put Him on, and in His Supper, that we may eat Him *by faith and spirit*, and mad have everlasting life by His cross and blood. And we say not, this is done slightly and coldly, but *effectually* and *truly*. For although *we do* NOT TOUCH *the* BODY *of Christ*

with teeth and mouth, yet we hold Him fast, and eat Him *by faith, by understanding and by the spirit.* And this is no vain *faith which doth comprehend Christ*; and that is not received with cold devotion, which is received *with understanding, with faith, and with spirit.*" (Pages 63, 64.)

IV.

"We justly blame the bishops of Rome, who, without the word of God, without the authority of the holy fathers, without any example of antiquity, after a new guise, do not only *set before the people* the sacramental *bread to be* WORSHIPPED as God, but do also carry the same about upon an ambling horse." (Ibid, p. 64.)

V.

"It is our *faith* that applieth the death and cross of Christ to our benefit, and *not the act of the* massing *priest.* 'Faith had in the sacraments,' saith Augustine, 'doth justify, and not the sacraments.' And Origen saith, 'Christ is the *priest*, the *propitiation*, and *sacrifice;* which propitiation cometh to every one *by mean of* FAITH.' So that by this reckoning, we say that the sacraments of Christ without faith do not once profit these that be alive: a great deal less do they profit those that be dead." (Pages 64, 65.)

VI.

"We affirm together with the antient fathers, that the body of Christ *is* NOT eaten *but of the* GOOD *and* FAITHFUL and of those that are endued with the Spirit of Christ." (Ibid, p. 92.)

VII.

"These men have changed all things, contrary to Christ's institution, and have made a private mass of the holy communion. And so it cometh to pass, that WE give *the Lord's Supper* unto the people, and THEY give them a *vain pageant* to GAZE *on*." (Ibid, p. 92.)

VIII.

"*Their* doctrine is, that Christ's very body effectually, and, *as they speak*, REALLY and SUBSTANTIALLY, may not only be *eaten* of WICKED and UNFAITHFUL MEN, but also (which is monstrous to be spoken) of mice and dogs." (Page 92.)

V.

Bullinger's Decades.

Although Henry Bullinger's name is not very often heard now, he was a very remarkable man. And though he was never in England, the thread of his life, is, in part, closely interwoven with the history of the English Reformed Church, in which he took a deep interest, and which may be truly said to owe much to him.

He was born 1504 not very far from Zurich.

"In his childhood he was preserved several times from

imminent perils; once from the plague and risk of premature interment; again, when by a fall in the street a whistle which was in his hand was driven into his neck; and again, when the enticement of a beggar would have stolen him from his home and friends."

From school at Emmerick he went to the University of Cologne 1519. Here he studied diligently the ancient Fathers. Here also he met with some of the earlier writings of Luther and Melancthon. Here also days and nights spent in the study of the New Testament were followed by an opening of his mind and heart to the reception of the Gospel.

For six years after 1523 Bullinger was engaged as a teacher of monks and students in the Cistercian Convent of Cappel. Here he formed aquaintance with Zuingle and Leo Judæ and was led by the former to the entire renunciation of the Corporal Presence in the Sacrament.

"In December of the same year, the senate of Zurich deputed Bullinger to accompany Zuingle to the important disputation at Berne. On his return he was prevailed on to undertake the pastoral office; and preached his first sermon on Sunday, June 21, 1528, at the village of Husen, near Cappel."

After incessant preachings and expositions in the neighbourhood of Bremgarten, in 1531 he succeeded Zuingle in the preachership of the Cathedral at Zurich.

"In this important post Bullinger continued for the remainder of his long life, labouring with most assiduous diligence and wide spread influence. For several years from 1531 to 1538, his preachings were daily, sometimes

twice in the day; his publications, of which many were suggested by passing events, were voluminous and frequent; his pastoral and synodical, civil and ecclesiastical engagements were unceasing and very various; his correspondence was exceedingly extensive and critical: and his house was always open, and his interpositions ready to shelter and befriend especially refugees from every country where religious persecution raged. And during the protracted efforts to effect a reconciliation between the Lutherans and the Church of Zurich on the sacramentarian question, his moderation and sincerity were eminently conspicious."

"In his extant diary Bullinger has marked March 29, 1547, as the day when Hooper and his wife, in their exile, accomplished their long-cherished desire of visiting him; and March 24, 1549, when they left him for England with their daughter Rachel, his godchild. In the end of May of the last mentioned year also Calvin and Farell came to Bullinger, and a consensus or agreement was completed on the subject of the Lord's Supper, between the Churches of Geneva and Zurich. At the same instant, as appeared by various decrees in the year following, the whole weight of the Papal party, imperial and ecclesiastical, was combining to condemn Bullinger and all his writings. But nothing turned him aside from his steady course of usefulness; and early in 1554 the largest influx of English refugees enjoyed his sympathy and interest. Among them were Parkhurst, Jewel, Horn, Pilkington, Lever, Hum-

phrey and Cole. Italian exiles from Locarno also sought and obtained like shelter in Zurich, through his interventions, in the spring of the year following."

"Early in October 1574, his last and fatal disorder attacked him. In the first instance, indeed, the severity of the seizure yielded so far to the remedies that were applied that he was able to resume his public duties. But the disease returned on the 24th of May in the year following with excruciating violence, and lasted until the 17th of September, when, after exhibiting a bright example of Christian patience, and having taken a touching personal farewell of all his colleagues, and written a letter to the Senate of Zurich, to be delivered after his decease) one object of which was to commend to them Rodolph Gualter as his successor), he expired, in the exercise of much prayer and in the peace of the gospel, in the 71st year of his age."*

I cannot do better than give the following account of the authoritative sanction which was given to Bullinger's Decades, in the words of Dean Goode, (on Eucharist, ii., p. 735-6).

"At the Convocation in 1586, the archbishop and bishops agreed to certain 'Orders,' of which the first was this:— 'Every minister having cure, and being under the degrees of Master of Art and Bachelor of Law, and not licensed to be a public preacher, shall, before the 2nd day of February

* See Biographical notice at the commencement of Decade V. in Parker Society's Edition.

next, provide a Bible and Bullinger's Decads, in Latin or English, and a paper book. And shall every day read one chapter of the Holy Scriptures; and note the principal contents thereof briefly in his paper-book. And shall every week read over one sermon in the said Decads, and note likewise the chief matters therein contained in the said paper [book]. And shall once in every quarter. . . . . show his said notes to some preacher near adjoining, to be assigned for that purpose.' And by the second of these 'Orders,' the said preachers are to certify to the archdeacon or bishop, 'who do perform the said exercises, and how they have profited therein.' (Strype's Whitgift, Appendix, No. 32. iii. 194, 195. Oxf. ed. See also Wilkins's Concilia, iv. 321.) Moreover, a copy of these 'Orders' was lodged with the Secretary of State in January, 1586, (1587 new style) the month after they were agreed upon by the bishops, and deposited by him in the State Paper Office (where they still remain) and endorsed, 'Orders for the Discipline of the Church.' So that, although they may not have received the formal and written authorization of the authorities of the State, they certainly were formally brought under their notice, and received their tacit sanction. And this was one of those more important documents of which Sir Joseph Williamson, Secretary of State in the time of Charles II. had copies for greater security. And in the title page of the edition of 1587 are the words (not found in the previous editions), 'Cum gratia et privilegio Regiæ Majestatis.' And so completely were these 'Orders' considered by the archbishop

to have received public sanction, that he expected that it would be inquired into in the following Parliament, how they had been observed, as he told the bishops in circular letter sent to them in November 1588. (See Strype's Whitgift, b. iii., c. xx., p. 531; Oxf. ed." See also Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. ii., p. 563.)

The following extracts are taken from his Decades as published in four volumes by the Parker Society.

I.

"But here some move many and divers questions touching the sacramental union, whether it be personal, real, or rational. I, because I see nothing of this matter doubtfully delivered of the Apostles, and that the thing, being plain of itself, by such manner of sophistications is made dark, doubtful, difficult, and obscure; simply and plainly say, that the sign and the thing signified are joined together in the sacraments by *God's institution*, by *faithful contemplation* and *use;* to be short, in *signification* and *likeness* of the things: but I UTTERLY DENY, that those two are naturally united together, so that the sign in the sacrament beginneth to be that which the thing signified is in his own substance and nature: I DENY, that the THING SIGNIFIED is *joined* corporally with the SIGN, so that the *sign* remaineth still in his own substance and nature, and yet nevertheless, in the mean time, hath the *thing signified corporally joined unto it;* that thereby *whosoever is partaker of the sign*, should be also *by the sign or with the sign* PARTAKER *of the* THING ITSELF.

The reason why I do so *constantly* DENY *that*, appeareth, I think, sufficiently by those examples which I have hitherto declared, and which hereafter shall be declared..... My saying is, that they are coupled together in a faithful contemplation, because they which partake the sacraments religiously do not fasten their eyes on sensible things only, but rather on things insensible, signified, and heavenly; so that the FAITHFUL have in themselves BOTH TWAIN *coupled together*, which OTHERWISE *in the sign or with the sign are knit together* with NO BOND." (Vol. iv., Dec. v., pp. 278, 279.)

II.

"After the same manner is it to be seen in the institution of the Lord's Supper or Eucharist. The bread is called the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ. But since the right faith believeth, that the true body of Christ, *ascended out of this world*, liveth and *is now in heaven*, and that the Lord returneth no more into this world until He come in the clouds of heaven to judge the quick and the dead, every man understandeth, that to the sign, to wit, bread and wine, the names of the things themselves, to wit, the body and blood of Christ, are given through the communicating of names." (Ibid, p. 282.)

III.

Christian faith doth attribute the grace of God, remission of sins, sanctification and justification, fully and wholly to the free mercy of God, and to the merit of Christ's passion; yea, in such sort doth Christian faith attribute these spiritual benefits unto it, that beside it nothing at all is admitted to

take part with it. Therefore where as Lombard saith, 'That *sacraments have received power* to confer or give grace by the merit of the passion of Christ, it is of HIS OWN FORGING. For as Christ giveth not His glory to any, either saint or mortal man, much less to a creature without life; even so he that believeth to be fully justified by the death and resurrection of the Lord, seeketh no further grace and righteousness in any other thing than in Christ only, upon whom he stayeth, whom also by faith he feeleth in his heart or mind already to exercise His force by the Holy Ghost.'" (Ibid, p. 304.)

IV.

"About this matter Bonaventura hath wonderfully busied himself, who in his writing, *In* 4. *Magistri Distinct., Quæst.* 3, among other things at the length saith: 'We must not say by any means that *grace is contained* substantially in the sacraments, as water in a vessel, or as a medicine in a box; yea, to understand it so, it is erroneous. But they are said to contain grace, in that they *signify* grace; and because, unless there be a want on the part of the receiver, grace is always *given in them:* so that ye must understand that grace is *in the soul*, and *not in the visible signs.* For this cause they are called also vessels of grace. They may be also called vessels after another manner, because, as that which is in a vessel is no part of it, neither cometh of it, and yet nevertheless is drawn out of; so grace cometh *neither of nor by* the sacraments, but springeth from the eternal fountain, and is drawn

out from thence by the soul in the sacraments." (Ibid, pp. 307, 308.)

V.

"But before I entreat further of the other ends of the supper, consisting in the description thereof; I will recite what other some allege of the promise and communion of Christ. They condemn our doctrine as heretical. For they contend, that the Lord promised that He would give unto the faithful His *very body and blood*, to be eaten and drunken *under the form of bread and wine;* therefore it must by all means, and without all contradiction, be believed, that the bread is the Lord's natural body, and the wine His blood; and that these ought to be eaten and drunken, not only spiritually, but also corporally, unto life everlasting. And that Christ is bodily present in the supper, and that the bread is His body and the wine His blood, thus they prove: That which the Lord speaketh cannot be false, for He is the truth itself; but He saith, that the bread is His body, and the wine His blood; therefore the bread and wine of the sacrament are verily, really, and essentially the body and blood of Christ. Which truth, they say, must simply be believed, although reason itself, the whole world, all senses, and nature itself, be against it. We answer: That indeed all things are *very true which the Lord hath spoken*, who is truth itself; but *in that sense* which He Himself said and understood, not in that meaning which we will enforce upon His words. Wherefore before all things we must search out *the true*

sense of *the Lord's words* in the supper, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood, etc.'

"These men cry out, saying, that the Lord's words ought to be expounded simply, and according to the letter; for they are the words of a testament; and that permitteth not His words to be expounded by a trope or figure. But we say, that all the evangelical and apostolical books are numbered under the title of the testament; and therefore throughout all and every place of the Scripture nothing must be corrupted, nothing added, nothing diminished, unless we will be subject to the curse of God. And yet we we are also constrained to confess, that there be infinite sentences in the Holy Scriptures, which, if we will proceed to expound simply according to the letter, we shall overthrow the whole Scripture and the true faith, or we shall seem to charge the Scriptures with lies and contradiction." (Ibid, pp. 435, 436.)

VI.

"Now it is manifest, that He spake of His true sensible body when He saith, 'This is my body,' for He addeth, 'Which is broken or given for you.' But the true, natural, sensible, or human body was delivered and died for us. But this appeareth not in the bread, or under the bread. Wherefore the Lord's words must be *expounded*. . . .Neither is there any cause why they should here, as it were, casting their mists before our eyes, and apply their coloured interpretation unto a rotten construction, using words,

'UNSPEAKABLY, SUPERNATURALLY, INVISIBLY, NOT QUALITIVELY, NOT QUANTIVELY, NOT AS IN A PLACE.' For by these terms they, intending in the meanwhile to bring some other thing to pass, do by the wonderful judgement of God quite subvert and overthrow all that is their own. For if this their mystery be unspeakable, why then do they use these terms, 'ESSENTIALLY, SUBSTANTIALLY, REALLY, CORPORALLY?' For they that speak so, do utter truly and set down the manner of His presence. If the bread be *supernaturally* the body of Christ, why then do they add *naturally?* And if the bread be Christ's body invisibly, then can it not be corporally, neither can it be a TRUE BODY, whose property is to be visible. Who would not laugh, if he should hear that fire burnt and gave no heat, and that light did shine and gave no light? If He be not present in quality, quantity, and as in a place, then is He *not corporally* present. For, I pray you, are not *qualities, quantities, and place*, belonging to the *body?* Hearken what Augustine saith unto Dardanus touching the presence of God: 'Take,' saith he, '*space of place* from *bodies*, and they shall be NOWHERE; and because they shall be nowhere, they shall *not be* AT ALL. Take the *bodies themselves* from the *qualities of bodies*, and they shall be NOWHERE; and therefore it must needs be they *cannot be* AT ALL.' Let not us therefore rob or spoil the LORD'S BODY of the *properties* thereof, and so deny the TRUTH *of* HIS BODY." (Ibid, pp. 443, 444. See also vol. iii., Dec. iv., pp. 263—267.)

VII.

"Paul saith: 'Declare the Lord's death UNTIL HE COME.' For thus we gather thereby: He whose remembrance is repeated until He come or return, He surely is not counted to be present, but is looked for to come; therefore the Lord's body which was given for us, the remembrance whereof is celebrated in the mystical supper, is NOT PRESENT, but is looked for to come." (Ibid p. 446.)

VIII.

"These sayings of the clarified body (which is that which ascended, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father) repugn wholly with *ubiquity* or being in *every place* and the *insensibility* of Christ's body; which notwithstanding must needs be granted, if we proceed to enforce the REAL PRESENCE of Christ's body out of the words of the supper simply understood." (Ibid p. 447.)

IX.

"For I am FLAT AGAINST that BODILY PRESENCE of Christ *in the bread*, which the papists defend and enforce upon the Church of God." (Ibid p. 452.)

X.

"In this present place, by a trope or allegory, he biddeth us to eat and drink the flesh and blood of Christ unto everlasting life. Therefore to eat Christ's flesh and

drink His blood is *nothing else but to* BELIEVE THAT CHRIST'S BODY WAS GIVEN FOR US AND HIS BLOOD SHED FOR US, *to the remission of sins;* and consequently, that we remain in Christ, and have Christ remaining in us. For the faith, whereof we spake, is not only an imagination or thought concerning things past and exceeding our capacity; but a *most certain assurance*, and a feeling of heavenly things received within in us, to our great commodity. For therefore not only faith, but the virtue and force of faith, is by the Lord signified in John by the allegory both of eating and drinking. Meat passeth not into the substance of our body without delight: so also by faith, through a great desire of the spirit, we are joined with Christ, that He may live in us, and we may live in Christ, and be partakers of all His good gifts. This is the spiritual eating of Christ, who *never thought*, no, not so much as once dreamed in this place, of the *gross* and *bodily eating*, which is indeed unprofitable. But forasmuch as the whole point of the controversy consisteth in these words of eating and drinking the flesh and blood of the Lord, they interpreting the same word bodily, and we spiritually, it seemeth good to be shewed that by the words of eating and drinking the Lord, meant *no other thing than* TO BELIEVE, and consequently to abide in Christ, and to have Christ abiding in us." (Ibid, p. 458.)

XI.

"I will recite what testimonies have been always alleged in the Church, out of the Holy Scriptures concerning the

two kinds of eating of Christ. Christ's body is eaten and His blood drunken spiritually; it is also eaten and drunken sacramentally. The spiritual manner is accomplished BY FAITH, whereby being united to Christ, we be made partakers of all His goodness. The sacramental manner is only performed in celebrating the Lord's Supper. The SPIRITUAL EATING IS PERPETUAL *unto* THE GODLY, because FAITH is to them *perpetual.* They communicate with Christ both *with out the supper and in the supper*; and by it they do more increase and continue their new beginnings, as we have also shewed before: and now, by adjoining of the holy action, all things are done more manifestly and plainly. As for the unbelievers and hypocrites, with their captain Judas, they never communicate with Christ, neither before the supper, nor in the supper, nor after the supper, inasmuch as they continue in their unbelief; but they [partake] of the Lord's sacraments to their own judgement and condemnation." (Ibid p. 463-4.)

XII.

"Wherefore the *unbelievers* do *neither* EAT THE LORD'S BODY *nor* DRINK *His* BLOOD." (Ibid, p. 465.)

XIII.

"Moreover, since we be priests, we must offer sacrifices worthy of our God. And we have sufficiently testified that, after Christ our high and only priest or bishop in all ages and in all the whole world, none doth offer a satisfactory

sacrifice to take away sin: for when He offered up Himself, He offered a sacrifice but once, howbeit always effectual to cleanse the sins of all. Therefore we offer unto Him thanksgiving and praise, celebrating the memory of that one only sacrifice: we offer prayers; we offer ourselves, that is to say, our bodies, a lively and a reasonable sacrifice to God, together with all kind of godliness and well-doing." (Volume iii., Dec. iv., p. 291.)

XIV.

"The name of the priest seemeth to be brought into the church out of the synagogue, for otherwise ye shall not find in the New Testament the ministers of the word of God and of churches to be called *priests*, but after that sort that all Christians are called priests by the Apostle Peter. But it appeareth that the ministers of the New Testament, for a certain *likeness* which they have with the ministers of the Old Testament, of ecclesiastical writers are called *priests*, for as they did their service in their tabernacle, so these also, after their manner and their fashion, minister to the Church of God. For otherwise the Latin word is derived of holy things: a man, I say, dedicated and consecrated unto God to do holy things. And holy things are not only sacrifices, but what things soever come under the name of religion; from which we do not exclude the laws themselves, and holy doctrine." (Volume iv., Dec. v., p. 108.)

XV.

"That the priesthood of Aaron is utterly abrogated, it is evident by the words which the apostle citeth out of David, saying: 'The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedech.' Christ, therefore, is the one and only high priest, having an immutable priesthood, which cannot by succession pass from Him to any other man or angel. For He now, standing at the right hand of the Father in heaven, the very true temple which was prefigured by the tabernacle and temple at Jerusalem, doth make intercession for us, and doth all the offices of an high priest: of whom the Apostle of Christ, St. Paul, doth speak very largely in his epistle unto the Hebrews. This Christ Jesus, our high priest, hath consecrated all the faithful to be kings and priests unto Himself. And yet notwithstanding he doth ordain ministers of the Church, by doctrine and examples to instruct the Church, and to minister the sacraments; I mean, not these old and ancient ones, but those which the Lord hath substituted instead of the old ones. What doctrine they must teach, He doth expressly declare. The mystical attire and garments of the priesthood He neither did commend to His apostles, nor leave to His Church, but took them away with all the ceremonies that are called the middle wall betwixt the Jews and Gentiles." (Volume ii., Dec. iii., pp. 262, 263.)

These extracts from Bullinger may be thought needlessly long and numerous. It is true that one—almost *any* one—extract might have sufficed to reveal Bullinger's view of the matter before us. Yet (apart from the real value of many of the quotations) it seemed desirable to show more than this: nay, it seemed important for us to see how *thoroughly pervaded* this work of Bullinger's is with principles diametrically opposed to the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence."

It is to be specially noted, that the subject of the Sacraments generally, and of the Eucharist in particular, is very deeply entered into in the fifth book of Decades. It occupies a large portion of a thick volume. It is entered into carefully and with considerable minuteness. It is treated in a searching manner, and with evident reference to existing controversies, not only with Romanists but Lutherans; the force of its arguments being directed, indeed, much more against the Real Corporal Presence than against Transubstantiation. And without a considerable number of extracts it would be impossible to do anything like justice to the general character of the teaching of the book in this matter. The force of the evidence which the book brings to bear on the question before us depends very much on this.

I am not wishing to magnify the authority of Bullinger's Decades. It would be most unreasonable to fasten on the teaching of the Church of England everything contained in four considerable-sized octavo volumes. It is not intended to claim more than the *general* approval of the Reformed Church of England of the doctrines which they teach. No *obiter dicta*, no teaching by the way, no occasional expressions of opinion on less important matters, or on matters not controverted at the time, ought fairly to be brought forward

from a book so sanctioned, as having stamped on them the seal of the English Church. But clearly the case is very different with a question which was agitating and dividing Protestant Europe. The "Yea" or the "Nay" of a book so sanctioned on such a question, we can hardly doubt was meant to be the "Yea" or the "Nay" of the English Church.

One expression of opinion distinct and decided on such a point, at such a time, must needs have caused, that the Church of England should be held responsible for lending her sanction to such teaching. But if such teaching be found not in one isolated passage, but standing out as a strong and prominent feature in the book—outspoken plainly, defined distinctly, appearing clearly, and reappearing and recurring, and woven into the very texture of the work, and made to show itself in an attitude of marked opposition to, and declared condemnation of, the very doctrine before us; if these opinions of decided opposition to anything like the doctrine in question are indeed made to stand out in bold relief; if their outline is sharp and clear; if the impress is strong, and the indentation deep,—then I ask, Can the general approval of such a work indicate anything less than an acknowledgment that the doctrine thus taught on a question so hotly contested is, as a whole, that which the Church of England desires to teach? that on the question of the Eucharistic Presence its "Yea" is her "Yea," and its "Nay" is her "Nay"?

Let me make bold to ask (in no unkindly or irreverent spirit) any one of those who hold the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, whether if the fourth volume of Bullinger's Decades were to have fallen into his hands without his knowing what it was, he would not have felt at once that the book was one which he could never desire to recommend

but one which he *would* desire seriously to caution anyone against, and that with the expression of strong disapproval, marking it with the stigma of very dangerous tendencies?

Has any strictly Lutheran Communion—any Communion maintaining a Real Corporal Presence—ever lent such a sanction as our Church lent to Bullinger's Decades? Would any Lutheran Communion ever think of so doing? If a strictly Lutheran Church *were* so to do, would it not be felt, by so doing, *ipso facto*, to be un-Lutheranizing herself? Then, in fairness, how are we to refuse the acknowledgment that our Church, so far as she has authorized Bullinger's Decades, has given authority to a denial of "The Real Objective Presence"?

In estimating the value of the testimony derived from these works, which have at certain times received sanction in the English Reformed Church, the Reader must be asked to observe (1) how completely they cover the whole Reformation Period. (2) How VERY DISTINCTLY they speak against any such view of the Eucharistic doctrine in that which is know by the name "Real Objective Presence." (3) That, however the sanction or quasi-authority, given to all or some of these books, may be regarded as having a temporary, rather than a permanent character, there is nothing in this to deduct from the value of their evidence as to our Church's views on this question, unless it can be shewn that our Church has since changed her mind, and has desired clearly to *unsay* that, to the *saying* of which she has here, so far, given her sanction.

PAPERS ON THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

No. V.

THE HOMILIES.

We have to enter now on the examination of a work which has a considerably higher claim on our attention than any which have occupied us hitherto. The two books of Homilies have a limited, but yet a marked and abiding authority * given them by the statement of our Article xxxv., "The Second Book of Homilies . . . . doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, . . . as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth." We have therefore reserved the Homilies to be entered upon *next, before* the examination of our authorized Formularies.

In the first Book of Homilies there is no Homily, in the second Book there is one Homily, on the subject of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Our appeal to that Homily will be a very simple, and, I think, a very satisfactory process. Not so simple a task will it be, to clear

* Limited, no doubt, (as in reason, for two books of such size, it must be,) by the expression, "doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times." (See Stillingfleet, quoted by Abp. Wake in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. xiii., pp. 8, 9.)

away first an obstacle which bars the way; because it involves the necessity of entering, to some extent, on collateral questions which have been introduced into the discussion. For at the end of the First Book of Homilies there stands a notice concerning the Second Book *then to be* issued. And this notice contains an expression, which is laid hold upon, by the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence, as a phrase necessarily teaching their doctrine, and as deliberately inserted and retained by the Church of England.

The notice is this—"Hereafter shall follow sermons . . . . of the due receiving of His blessed Body and Blood, *under the form of bread and wine*."

That we may be able therefore to enter on an unprejudiced view of the teaching of our Homily itself, it will be necessary for us first to deal with the objection which lies at the threshold; one which our opponents seem to regard as of the highest importance; and one, against the removal of which they seem to have concentrated their strength. This objection appears to be * the chiefest of

*"The first 160 pages of Dr. Pusey's work (*i.e.*, The Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church), and nine of the Appendix, are spent upon a discussion of the meaning of the Advertisement at the end of the First Book of Homilies. . . . . And nothing, I think, can more clearly show the extremities to which Dr. Pusey is driven for the defence of his cause, than that certain words in a mere *Advertisement*, inserted in 1547 (before any of our reformed Formularies had been drawn up), at the end of the First Book of Homilies, should be one of the chief authorities on which he depends to prove his doctrine to be the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England. . . . . On this point the only argument I can find in these 160 pages is that if there had been a change of view in our Ecclesiastical authorities, such that these words no longer expressed their doctrine, they would not have been allowed to remain at the end of the First Book of Homilies. Now, to say nothing of the absurdity of elevating a mere *Notice* of this kind to the position of an authoritative dogmatic

their strongholds, and one from which they seem to think, it must be impossible for them to be driven.

It is this importance attached to the matter by those who differ from us, which makes it necessary to occupy some space in dealing with it, and calls for the request that my readers will give careful attention to a question which might otherwise appear trivial.

My plan will be to aim at shewing three things :

1st. That it is like straining at a gnat, to attempt to fasten any doctrine, as the doctrine of the Church of England, on words standing *where* and *as* this expression stands.

2ndly. That even if these words were in the highest degree authoritative, there is nothing really in them on which the doctrine in question can fairly be fastened.

3rdly. That, therefore, the way is quite clear for an unbiassed examination of the Homily itself, that IT may bear witness, as to what the doctrine of the Book of Homilies really is on the question.

I. I am to show that the position and relation of the words is such that it is like straining at a gnat to fasten on them any doctrine as the doctrine of the Church of England.

declaration, Dr. Pusey has himself admitted a fact which overturns this argument. For he tells us that Cranmer, though holding, and intending to express by this *Advertisement*, the doctrine of the Real Presence in the bread and wine, afterwards went over to the Swiss School (pp. 10, 11). Did, then, Cranmer expunge the *Advertisement* after this change of view? No. What, then, is the necessary conclusion that follows? Clearly that this Advertisement was not regarded as a statement of any authority in our Church." (Goode on Eucharist, Supplement, pp. 20—22.)

Let me endeavour to lead to a fair view of this matter by help of an illustration.

Supposing I had once held the doctrine of transubstantiation or consubstantiation, and while thus holding, I put forth a volume of sermons, and on the last page had printed a notice, declaring my intention of writing hereafter another volume, in which I purposed to treat among other matters "of the due receiving of the blessed body and blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine," (expressing myself in language common among Romanists and not unused by Lutherans.) And supposing, that in after years, by further consideration and conference with friends, I had quite come over to the reformed views on the Eucharist, and now with these changed opinions I wrote as I intended on the subject, in a sermon expressive of my views, putting forth my new volume containing the promised sermon on the Eucharist, not with the title by which it was promised, but with the heading, "On the worthy receiving of the Sacrament." And suppose further, that now requiring a curate and anxious to secure one of my own way of thinking, I were to put into his hands my two volumes of sermons, asking him to declare his general adhesion to the views therein expressed—should I expect—would any one expect, that such a person, having read through and examined both volumes, would say to himself thus, "The views which I am expected to assent to are clearly those of the Real Corporal Presence, for though the second volume contains a sermon on the Lord's Supper, the teaching of which is certainly opposed to it, and shews that the writer's views are now the views of the Reformed, yet the first volume, which was written, I know, when the writer was either a Papist on this subject, or in a sort of transition state, has appended to it a notice of this sermon

as forthcoming; and there it has given to it a title, which indicates views of a different character"?

I have no fear as to what the answer of an unprejudiced reader will be. I am sure THIS *would* be regarded as straining at a gnat indeed.

But then are the cases parallel? Sufficiently parallel, I think, for our purpose. For—

First.—At the date of the putting forth of the First Book of Homilies (early in Edward's reign, A.D. 1547), the Church of England was in a transition state as to matters of doctrine. The Reformation effected in Henry VIII.'s reign may be spoken of as political, rather than doctrinal,* or, at least (for the matter of doctrine), incipient and preparatory, rather than actual or attained.

In the early part of King Edward's reign, when the First Book of Homilies went forth, the reforming party, with Cranmer at their head, had by no means thoroughly separated themselves, either from the *party*† which adhered to the teaching of the Church of Rome, or from the *doctrines* which we now regard as the doctrines of the Church of Rome. One of the Homilies in that Book (very unexceptionable indeed

* It will, I trust, be understood, that the extracts from Tyndale's Writings, in Paper No. II., were given with a view of shewing that the doctrine of the Corporal Presence was not held, at an earlier period, by *some* of those whose names are usually classed among the pioneers of the English Reformation. On Tyndale's character and work, and his relation to the English Reformation, the reader may be glad to be referred to Westcott's "General View of the History of the English Bible" (Macmillan), pp. 29—70, 173—211; and Appendix.

† "Cranmer communicated it [*i.e.*, the First Book of Homilies] to Gardiner, and would fain have gained his approbation of it; but he was so inflamed at being left out of the King's will, that he constantly opposed all innovation till the King should be of age." (Neal's History of Puritans, vol. i., p. 32.)

in its teaching) came from the pen of Bonner.* And Cranmer † at that time held either the Romish or the Lutheran doctrine on the Lord's Supper.

We know that two years after this, before the publication of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., 1549, there was a long and earnest dispute among the bishops,‡ whether transubstantiation should be established or rejected.§

And Secondly—When the Second Book of Homilies came out in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, not only does the Homily on the Lord's Supper teach (as will be seen

*That is, the Homily "Of the Misery of Mankind." (See Hook's Lives of the Archbishops, vol. ii., New Series. p. 212.)

†Dean Goode considers that Cranmer at this date held *transubstantiation*. (See "On Eucharist," i., p. 47.) Dr. Pusey, on the other side, argues from Cranmer's words that he had *for many years* ceased to believe in transubstantiation, and now held the Lutheran doctrine. (See "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 19, *sqq*.)

Dean Hook says, "The date of the Archbishop's renunciation of the dogma of transubstantion is doubtful," but "in 1546 he had not given up the dogma." (Lives of Archbishops, vol. ii., New Series, pp. 155—209. See also 216, 260, 261, 263, Notes: Hardwick's Reformation, p. 225; Soames's Reformation, vol. iii., pp. 177, 178.)

Bishop Harold Brown thinks Cranmer held transubstantiation throughout the reign of Henry VIII., and that "most probably there may have been some gradual progress in his convictions." ("On Articles," pp. 704, 705.) The question does not seem to be material.

‡Probably (as Dr. Pusey thinks) between the reforming bishops, and the bishops who adhered to the old learning. Whether it were so or not, the dispute is evidence of the then transitional state of the English Church.

§See Dryander's Letter to Bullinger in Orig. Letters, P. S. Edit., vol. i., p. 351, and Goode on Eucharist, i., p. 47; also Pusey's "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 17.

presently) the anti-Lutheran doctrine, but while the other Homilies (for the most part) have the same titles, or nearly the same, as those by which they were advertised or promised in the notice appended to the First Book; in the case of *this* Homily, it is observable that the title is changed. And not only so—but it is specially to be marked that the article which establishes the authority of the Homilies, does in the case of the Second Book, what it does not in the case of the First—that is, it inserts* a list of their titles. And in the Article, the title of the Homily in question is *not* in the doubtful or objectionable language in which it was promised at the end of the First: but is the altered and amended title by which it is headed in the Second. In other words, the Article knows no Homily with any such title as "Of the due receiving of Christ's blessed Body and Blood, under the form of Bread and Wine." But it sets down the title of the Homily in question as "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ"; while in the "Table of

* The words of the Article are "The Second Book of Homilies, the SEVERAL TITLES *whereof* we have joined under this Article." This insertion of the *titles* is observable. Hardwick says (of 1563) "The thirty-fourth was made to specify the titles of the Homilies (with the exception of that against Rebellion, which was published afterwards)" (On Articles p. 129.) By this specification of titles, the answer of the Article was clearly given to any question which might arise such as this, "What is true title of this Homily? Is it that by which it was promised in the notice, or that by which it is headed in the Second Book?" The Article which gives authority to the Homilies recognises each Homily by ONE TITLE ONLY. That one title it specifies, and, in the case of the Homily before us, it is not the title "of the due receiving of His blessed body and blood, under the form of Bread and Wine," which title the Article gives no sanction to; but it is the title "of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ."

Homilies ensuing," which stands at the commencement of the Second Book, it is named simply "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament"; and the Heading which stands before the Homily itself is, "An Homily of the worthy receiving, and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ."

I submit therefore, that words in such a position (appended to the First Book of Homilies), and in such a relation* (to the Second Book of Homilies containing the Homily promised) cannot have fastened on them any doctrine, as a doctrine taught by the Church of England.

II. But I contend, secondly, that even if these words carried with them the highest symbolical authority, there is actually nothing in them on which the doctrine in question can fairly be fastened.

I am quite aware that in maintaining this, I am maintaining what to most people will seem paradoxical. Yet, not the less do I hope to maintain and establish it.

It is quite true that the phrase "under the form of bread and wine," was, in England at least, almost given up to the Romanists.

It is true, also, that this phrase (as connected with *the Presence*) "being under the forms of bread and wine" was most emphatically repudiated by Cranmer, and repudiated by him on behalf of the English Church and her Prayer Book. For when Gardiner (perhaps having in his mind the very notice before us) alleged that they who teach

* The expression is sometimes quoted, as from "The Book of Homilies." But certainly it forms no part of any of the Homilies. By Mr. Machonochie (Address Jan. 1867, p. 5,) it is cited as from the "Title to Second Book of Homilies." But it would surely have been more correct to style it "The Rejected Title of one of the Homilies in the Second Book."

that "Christ is in the bread and wine" "agree in form of teaching with that the Church of England teacheth at this day, in the distribution of the holy communion, in that it is there said, *the body and blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine.*" (In Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 51,)—the answer of Cranmer (and it is an answer to be carefully observed) was this; "As concerning the form of doctrine used in this Church of England in the Holy Communion, that the body and blood of Christ be under the forms of bread and wine, when you shall show *the place where* THIS FORM OF WORDS IS EXPRESSED, then shall you purge yourself of that, which in the meantime I take to be a PLAIN UNTRUTH." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 53.)

Cranmer, therefore, I repeat, on behalf of our Formularies (in the moulding of which his influence was supreme) repudiated a phrase which implied *presence* "under the form of bread and wine."* And it seems to me clear, that

* I quote the following words of Dean Goode because they seem clearly and forcibly to express the common sense view of the case. "If the Advertisement at the end of the First Book of Homilies had been of any authority as an exponent of the doctrine of the Church of England, and been, as Dr. Pusey asserts without the slightest authority, a statement in which Cranmer himself had 'embodied' his belief in the doctrine of the Real Presence in the bread and wine, could he have used the words to Gardiner? If the form of words in question occurred in any formulary of authority in our Church, that was equivalent to their being in the 'Communion Book.' But Cranmer evidently repudiates the phrase altogether as one used by the Church of England. In fact it is obvious, that a mere announcement at the end of an authoritative Formulary, that the authorities of the Church intend at some future time to publish of doctrine on a particular subject, can bind nobody, even at the time when it is put forth. That it may be some indication of the views entertained *at the time* by the person who inserted it, is of course readily granted. But beyond that it *cannot have the slightest force or value.*" (On Eucharist, Supplement, p. 22-3.)

in these words of Cranmer must be a repudiation also of all authority for the notice at the end of the First Book of Homilies, if the words contained in that notice are to be held as implying anything equivalent to "the presence of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine." Anyhow, the thing specially to be noticed is this, that when Gardiner (by some mistake or other) asserted just what our modern Ritualists assert now—that the Church of England stands committed to a form of words equivalent to a statement of the *presence* or *being* of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine; the assertion was met by a counter assertion (containing a most distinct denial) from one, who above all others was competent to make it.

But I must be allowed to contend that "*to be* RECEIVED under the form of bread and wine" is not equivalent to *being under* or *being* PRESENT *under* the form of bread and wine," that the receiving under the form of bread and wine implies, of necessity, no "being" or "being present" under these forms—except it be (in the language of our Reformers) only *sacramentally* or *symbolically*, that is NOT REALLY, but *representatively;* and that the objections which might lie against the one form of expression, do not necessarily lie against the other. Does not the receiving of one thing under the form of another thing rather imply the absence than the presence of the thing received? Many things are continually being *conveyed* and *received* under the forms of papers signed and parchments sealed, which certainly are *never present* under the forms of the paper or parchment.

And as a mere matter of fact, I will cite instances to show that the phrase "under the form of bread and wine," was not regarded by the Reformers as, of necessity, implying a doctrine which they rejected; but was sometimes (though

rarely) used or allowed (by divines most distinctly opposed to the Corporal Presence,) sometimes in language speaking of *giving* or *receiving* the "Res sacramenti" *under these forms*, (or the like), and sometimes even in language speaking of the *being* or *being present* of the "Res sacramenti," (NOT REALLY, but *sacramentally* or *symbolically*) under these forms.

(1) I will appeal, first, to the testimony of Foxe's "Acts and Monuments," which may be said to possess (in some sense, and in some degree) the sanction * of the English Church.

* It was dedicated to the Queen, and was in such high estimation that it was ordered to be set up in the Churches. It is said that Queen Elizabeth had a particular esteem for the author. (See Neal's History of Puritans, vol. i., p. 124.)

"Quivis archiepiscopis et episcopus habebit domi suæ sacra Biblia in amplissimo volumine, uti nuperrime Londini excusa sunt, et *plenam illam historiam, quæ inscribitur* 'MONUMENTA MARTYRUM,' et alios quosdam similes libros ad religionem appositos. Locentur autem isti libri vel in aula, vel in grandi cænaculo, ut et ipsorum famulis et advenis usui esse possint." "*Eosdem illos libros*, quos proxime diximus, decanus quisque curabit emi, et locari in ecclesiâ sua cathedrali ejusmodi in loco, ut a vicariis et minoribus canonicis, et ministris ecclesiæ, et ab advenis, et peregrinis commode audiri et legi possint. *Eosdem libros* illos decanus et primarius quisque residentiarius, quos appellant ecclesiæ dignitates, Ement suo quisque famulitio, eosque opportuno aliquo in loco, vel in aula, vel in cænaculo locabunt." (Canons of 1571. Cardwell's Synodalia, p. 115.) "Quivis archidiaconus habebit domi suæ et alios libros et nominatim eos, qui inscribuntur MONUMENTA MARTYRUM." (Ibid, p. 117.)

Strype says of these Canons that in the framing of them, "the Archbishop [Parker], and the bishops of Ely and Winton, had the main hand: but all the bishops of both provinces in synod, in their own persons or by proxy, signed it; but not the Lower House. And the Archbishop laboured to get the Queen's allowance to it, but had it not: she often declining to give her license to their orders and constitutions, reckoning that her bishops' power and jurisdiction alone, having their authority derived from her, was sufficient." (See Strype's Parker, book iv., chap. v., p. 322, Edit. 1711.) There is no doubt that the Canons were reviewed by the Queen. (See Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., pp. 113, 114, Note.)

Among the serious accusations brought against Foxe, no one, I believe, has ever charged him with holding or teaching "the Real Objective Presence"; nor is anyone, I think, very likely so to do. Yet Foxe certainly held that such a form of expression as that in the notice before us, was capable of a very sound interpretation, provided only that it be so understood (as indeed the Ritualists profess to understand it) as not to exclude the material substance of the elements. With such explanation, Foxe would acknowledge the giving and receiving, and (in a *sacramental* sense) even the *presence* of the "*res sacramenti*" *under the form of bread and wine* "to the inward eye of faith, and mouth of the soul."

His testimony on this point is so very clear and decisive, and so completely covers and shelters* with his approval the

* The extract given does, indeed, so completely shelter and cover (and more than shelter and cover) the expression in the Notice, that some, to whom it has been shown, have even desired to have evidence brought forward that Foxe himself did not hold the Real Objective Presence. And the opinion has been expressed that, without such evidence, the extract may be regarded as giving strength and support to the Ritualists. The following quotations, therefore, are given to satisfy any who may be in doubt as to Foxe's views. "They [the papists] consider not the nature of a sacrament; which is, NOT *to exhibit* the thing in deed which it doth *represent*, but to REPRESENT *effectually* ONE THING by *another:* for that is the property of a sacrament to bear a *similitude* of one thing by *another thing;* of the which *two things* the *one* is *represented*, the *other*, indeed, *exhibited*. . . . . They consider not the operation of faith, which, penetrating up *to heaven*, THERE *apprehendeth* the REAL BODY of Christ, no less, yea, and more effectually, than if he were here bodily present to the eye. . . . . They seem either not to weigh the operation of Christ's passion enough, or else not to feel the heavy torment of sin and miserable hunger of man's soul; which, if they did feel, they would easily perceive what a necessary and opportune nourishment to man's conscience were the body of Christ on the cross broken, and his blood shed." (Edit. Seeley, vol. vi., pp. 521, 522.)

expression in the notice, that I think it worth while to give rather a long quotation at length.

In the Act of the "Six Articles," the first Article is this,

"So was the body of Christ once present here on earth with us, and shall be again at the day of his coming. Otherwise it is *not here really present*, but ONLY to our *faith, really*, that is to say, *truly, apprehending his body* IN HEAVEN, and here feeding upon the same in earth. And thus he is *present* ONLY *to good men*, whether *with* the symbols or *without* the symbols." (Ibid, p. 523.)

"The body of Christ is *really eaten*. *Really*, NOT with our *bodily mouth*, but with the *mouth of* FAITH; apprehending the real body of Christ, who suffered for us, and worketh to us nourishment of life and grace," etc. (Ibid, p. 523.)

"Spiritually we say his body to be present, when either the body of Christ is present to our *spirit and faith;* or when the *virtue* of his body is present and redoundeth to our bodies and spirits by grace." (Ibid, p. 523.)

"Sacramentally we eat with our bodily mouth the mysteries of bread and wine, NOT *being the real body*, indeed, but *representing* the *real body*, indeed; *i.e.*, 'Non panem Dominum sed panem Domini.'" (Ibid, p. 524.)

"The sacrament, as it is not the real body itself of the Lord, so it *causeth not* itself any *real conjunction* betwixt Christ's real body and ours, but *representeth* the same; declaring that as the material bread, digested in our bodies, is united to the same, so the body of Christ, being received by faith, changeth our spirits and bodies to the nature of him." (Ibid, p. 524.)

"The operation of the sacraments is thought by the papists to give grace, which, in very deed, *give not grace* of their own work; but only serve as instruments and means of that grace and life which cometh from God." (Ibid, p. 525.)

"No promise made to bread and wine as they be common bread and wine: but as they be sanctified and made sacraments of the Lord's body and blood, they are not now called bread and wine, but have a *promise annexed to them*, or RATHER (*to say the truth*) annexed to the RECEIVERS *of them*." (Vol. vi., p. 494, note 2.)

"That in the most blessed sacrament of the altar by the strength and efficacy of Christ's mighty word (it being spoken by the priest), is *present really, under the form of bread and wine*, the natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary; and that after the consecration there remaineth no substance of bread and wine, or any other substance, but the substance of Christ, God and man."

On this article Foxe writes:—

"We will . . . make a little stay in our story, and examine this aforesaid article by true antiquity and the course of histories; to try whether it be a doctrine new or old.

"Now therefore, for the better discussing of the matter, let us first orderly and distinctly advise the *words* of the articles; the contents of which article consist of two parts or members. In the first thereof is noted to us a *presence* of a thing there was not before: in the second, is noted a

Those who may require further satisfaction on this subject may be referred to the whole Foxe's "Observations on Censures," vol. vi., pp. 520—525.

It may be observed that in the midst of this teaching, so clearly contradictory of the "Real Objective Presence," Foxe still speaks of "sacramental manducation of Christ's body, UNDER, and *with, the elements* of bread and wine" (p. 522); and that not far before (p. 512), he gives a note on Harpsfield's words, "His presence with the Spirit UNDER THE FORMS whereby it is given." And the note is this:—"'*Under the forms*,' that is, under the *properties* of bread and wine: and *so* ALL THIS IS TRUE."

Foxe's observations on the Eucharistic Controversy with the Lutherans will be found in vol. iv., pp. 317, 318; and vol. v., pp. 9—11.

privation or *absence* of a thing which there was before present.

"The presence is noted by these words of the article, where it is said that in the blessed sacrament, by the words pronounced, are present the natural body and blood of our Saviour *under the forms of bread and wine*, so that in these words, both the sacrament and the natural body are imported necessarily to be present. For else, how can a natural body of Christ be present in the sacrament under the forms of bread and wine, if the sacrament there were not present itself? or how can a thing be said to be in that which is not there? Wherefore by these words both the sacrament, and also the body, must necessarily have their being and presence, the one being in the other. And this presence, both of the sacrament and of the body, being rightly taken, *may right well stand together;* the sacrament to the outward eyes and mouth of man, the body of Christ to the inward eyes of faith, and mouth of the soul. And therefore touching these propositions in the article, 'in' and 'under,' if the question be asked, In what is the body of Christ? it may be well answered, In the sacrament, to the eyes of faith: like as the outward sacrament is also present to the outward eyes of the body. Again, if the question be asked, UNDER WHAT IS THE BODY OF CHRIST? it may be well *answered*, UNDER THE FORMS OF BREAD AND WINE, so as the doctors did *take the forms to mean* the *outward elements and natures* of the sacrament, and not the accidents.

"And thus, to the *first part* of the *article*, being WELL

EXPOUNDED,* we *do* ASSENT and CONFESS *the same* to have been the TRUE CATHOLIC OPINION, *approved by the ancient doctors* and CONSENT OF ALL TIMES, even *from the* FIRST IN-

* No doubt Foxe's words quoted above *require* a favourable construction. So, also, it is granted, do the words of the notice. But it is clear that Foxe's words *admit* of a favourable construction. And if so, *much more* do the words of the notice. But the argument of the Ritualists depends entirely on the assumption that the words CANNOT *possibly admit* of any other construction than their own.

That Foxe's language, standing alone, would be very open to misinterpretation is willingly granted: much more so than the words of the notice. So would my saying "There is a large sum of money under this paper," if there was nothing REALLY *under* it at all. Not so, however, if I were desiring to explain to another the nature of a transaction he had witnessed, and were to say to him, "You have seen here, *under these forms*, the conveyance of an estate, and of its purchase money. If you ask, 'Under what was the estate?' I answer, 'Under the form of that parchment sealed.' If you ask, 'Under what was the money paid?' I answer, 'Under that cheque which you saw signed.'" There would be no room for misunderstanding the expression here. And quite as little room is there for misunderstanding Foxe's words after reading the quotations in the previous note. Foxe's words can be intended by him to convey but one sense, and that sense certainly not the sense which the argument of the Ritualists *actually requires* them to convey.

Our Reformers, as we have seen, regard the outward signs or elements as really offering to us; and to the believing receiver, really communicating that which they signify and represent. Therefore (after the manner of the ancient Fathers) they allow the *sign* to bear the name of the *thing signified*,—the *sacramentum* to bear the name of the *res sacramenti*. And, according to this use of language, they speak of the *presence*, and the reception of the *res sacramenti* wherever the *sign* or *sacrament* is *present*, and is *received*. Hence the distinction between the *sacramental* presence and reception of the *res sacramenti*, (which is the presence only of the *sign* or *sacrament* which bears its name,) and its *real* presence, or *real* reception, (which is the presence or reception of the very *res sacramenti* itself).

STITUTION *of this sacrament*." (Acts and Monuments, A.D. 1540, in Sceley's Edition of 1838, vol. v., p. 266.)*

According to the same use of language the *res sacramenti* may always be said to be *under the sacramentum* or sign which represents it, NOT REALLY, but sacramentally, symbolically, figuratively, representatively, yet in the ministration REALLY *present*, (because truly and effectually communicated) "to the inward eye of faith and mouth of the soul." It is, plainly, in this sense only that Foxe speaks of Christ's Body as being "under the forms of bread and wine." And this sense of Foxe's words will be found abundantly confirmed and illustrated by the quotations which follow in the text.

But while adducing Foxe's testimony that such language was regarded as defensible and allowable on the principles of our Reformers, and is, therefore, capable of a favourable construction still, on the principles of the English Reformation, I must be allowed to guard myself from seeming to intimate that such language is desirable *now*, or to be approved, except it be used with great caution, and due care that it be not misunderstood. That such caution should be needed is owing, indeed, I conceive, not to any error in the words, but to the error of doctrine which has grown upon them, and which now claims them as its own. That claim we do not admit. But since it is made and maintained so tenaciously, we are bound, if we use such words, to see that such doctrine is not allowed to cling to them, or be conveyed by them.

If, however, such like expressions were used in a *sacramental* (NOT REAL) sense, (and so explained) by some of the ancient Fathers, and if the error of the Church of Rome consists in imputing to them a *real* (NOT *sacramental* sense), and so fastening upon them a doctrine which our Reformers learnt to reject;—then it was, indeed, only natural and right for our Reformers to be very cautious in using such expressions themselves, and to require them to be "well expounded"; but it obviously did not follow that they were bound absolutely to reject and renounce them altogether. Rather, I think we may say, they were bound to maintain (as, I think, it will be seen they did maintain) that they were quite capable of being understood

* See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 866.

If it be alleged that Foxe is to be regarded as a historian rather than a theologian, it may be said in reply, that, at any rate, he was certainly not unversed in the Eucharistic controversy, nor in the language which belonged to it.

in a sense which involved no such doctrine as the "Real Presence" taught by Romanists and Lutherans. On the use of such sacramental language, (*excluding* REALITY from the *representative* presence to which it is applied) see Paper II., pp. 97—100; and note there.

Perhaps, after all, some may think the true construction of Foxe's words to be forced, and, therefore, may prefer to regard Foxe's language *(after the growth of false doctrine)* as lax and incautious—as needing an apology, and scarcely defensible—as language which he would have done well to correct. But, then, let it be remembered that this is a subject on which language may fairly be allowed to claim some *specially* favourable construction; at least, when other testing passages are found, sufficient to determine and limit the sense. And then, let it be asked—might not the Church of England, under the circumstances, be allowed one somewhat loose expression, and have credit given her for subsequently correcting it?

One thing at any rate is perfectly clear,—that, whether we may consider it loose language or not, such language *could* be used, and *was* used, at the period of the Reformation, by those who did not hold the Real Objective Presence. And this is all that would be needed to make void the arguments which have been built on this expression in the notice, *even if* the words of the notice were the same as the words of Foxe. But, in truth, they are *very far, indeed*, from being the same. There is a *very wide difference* between language which speaks of "*receiving* under the forms," and "*being* under the forms." And the one, it will be allowed, much more readily admits of a favourable construction than the other. Or, in other words, it is very much more natural to give the sense of the Reformed to the words of the notice, than to the words of Foxe.

I can well understand that the language of Foxe may be thought highly objectionable now. But I cannot see that the language of the notice is fairly open to any other objection than that of being capable of misconstruction, and having been commonly used to express the doctrine of the Papists.

Clearly John Foxe and the Church of England stand together at the same bar. The evidence against the Church of England at most amounts to but this, that she had given approval (supposing this proved) to an expression which has been thought to sound in favour of a Corporal Presence, and that having uttered it, she afterwards corrected it. The evidence against John Foxe amounts to this, that he has given a deliberate and undoubted approval of (may be said, indeed, to have stood up in defence of) a very similar, but more objectionable form of expression.

If Foxe is to be found guilty, upon the evidence, of holding and maintaining and teaching, the "Real Objective Presence," the Church of England may perhaps come under the same condemnation. But if Foxe must be acquitted, because none will accuse, and none will condemn him; then certainly the Church of England must be acquitted also. In other words, it must be allowed that the expression in the notice before us is no evidence whatever of Lutheran doctrine.

Those who would argue from this expression, that the Church of England must needs intend to teach the doctrine now, by these words, taught by the Ritualists, and that therefore *we* must altogether change our views of our Church's teaching—must themselves, I think, first be prepared altogether to alter their own views of the hitherto despised martyrologist: they must be prepared to claim him as their own, to take him as one of themselves, and to maintain that John Foxe was at least a Lutheran in the matter of the Lord's Supper. If they are not prepared to do this, there is no other alternative, but to acknowledge (and I feel sure it *will* be acknowledged) that it is quite possible to speak as this notice speaks, and yet to have no thought of teaching any such Eucharistic doctrine, as is now assumed to be inseparable from the words.

(2) Next I must direct special attention to what was said by Ridley, when, in his disputation at Oxford, he had to deal with the proposition that "In the sacrament of the altar, by virtue of God's word spoken by the priest, the natural body of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, and His natural blood, are really *present under the forms of bread and wine.*"* Ridley complains that the proposition is "very

* If the evidence from his writings, adduced in Paper No. II., could leave any doubt remaining as to Ridley's real views—then, those who, maintaining the Real Objective Presence, have claimed Ridley on their side, might be asked—

(1) To observe, that here is a proposition submitted to Ridley, couched in the very terms which they seem to delight in, as most naturally and accurately expressing their views of the Eucharistic Presence.

(2) To consider, how very simple a thing it would have been for Ridley (if he had held their doctrine) to have assented at once to this proposition in its natural sense, instead of gratuitously allowing himself to be burnt for denying it (for the denial of *this* was the *primary* charge on which he was condemned). (See Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 286); and not only that, but laying (Ibid, p. 409) the guilt of his blood (which, upon this hypothesis, should rather have been upon his own head) at the door of those who condemned him for not holding a doctrine, which (upon this hypothesis) he really did hold and did actually express in his disputation—only that he chose to express it by way of a long and tangled discussion, instead of by way of one simple word of assent to a proposition which (upon this hypothesis) should have at once commended itself to his acceptance without one word of explanation or deduction.

If all this is still insufficient, let those who claim Ridley and throw overboard Cranmer (as Dr. Pusey: see "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent," pp. 34—36; and "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," pp. 11 and 159), be asked to consider not only that Cranmer owed his change of views to Ridley, and knew no difference between his own doctrine and Ridley's; but that Ridley had evidently well studied Cranmer's book, and was prepared

obscure and dark, by means of sundry words of doubtful signification."* And while repudiating the proposition as "false and erroneous" in "the sense which the schoolmen teach," he goes on to point out its ambiguities. Among others (pertaining to the earlier part of the proposition, with which we are not here concerned) he numbers the word "*really*" (*really present*), granting in one sense "Christ's body to be really in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper:" and also "these words, *under the forms of bread and wine*," *in which* he says, "there is a further *doubtfulness* . . . whether the *forms* be there taken to signify the only accidental and outward *shews* of bread and wine; or therewithal the substantial natures thereof, which are to be seen by their qualities, and perceived by exterior senses."

And going on to condemn the Romish sense (which take away the substances) as *false* and *erroneous*, and as a *detestable* heresy; he seems to imply that the expression "under the forms of bread and wine" (when so understood as to *include* "the substantial natures thereof") was quite capable of being so explained as not to convey a false or erroneous sense.

Indeed, I think, putting Ridley's words here beside his other sayings, it is clear that with the addition of the word "*sacramentally*" (which will be equivalent to Bishop Bilson's συμβολικῶς to be quoted presently, and which means, as we have seen, "*not* really"), Ridley would have had no hesitation in allowing the phrase "present under

to stand by it, and would have counted it "*glory*" to have written it. (See Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., pp. 160, 161.) If all this fails to convince, add his approval of Edward the Sixth's Catechism, and Bradford's Sermons. (See Papers No. II. and IV.)

* See Ridley's Works, p. 195.

the form of bread and wine" as not incapable of bearing a meaning which he would have approved.

He evidently seems to mean that in the sense in which he knows the doctrinal statement to be proposed to him, he could by no means accept it; but yet that the terms of the statement were capable of being so emptied of that sense as to contain nothing more than he could approve; and that, under protestation of excluding such other sense, he would not feel himself bound altogether to refuse the very words of the proposition submitted to him. Much more then, I think, would Ridley have allowed the phrase "*received* under the form of bread and wine," as quite capable of being understood in a sound and anti-Lutheran sense.

It appears to me (and I incline to think that all who study Ridley's words attentively will come to the same conclusion) that (1) there are two requirements in Ridley's mind, in order to his accepting the words "really present under the form of bread and wine"; (2) that these requirements demand, in Ridley's judgment, no sense to be put on the words but what they may fairly be made to bear, (only that he is well aware that their *doubtfulness* admits also another sense which his adversaries notoriously would have them convey); (3) that these requirements are (*a*) that "really" shall be understood *transcendenter*, (which will exclude the *corporal* or *objective* sense, and leave the *sacramental*); and (*b*) that "forms" shall be understood to include *material substances*.

Let this much be conceded, and Ridley will demand no alteration in the words "really present under the forms of bread and wine."

Does Ridley make any objection to the phrase beyond that which pertains to the ambiguities which would thus be removed?

Does not his language imply that (however his opponents might object) the words themselves might well bear the removal, and then might be admitted as true?

Setting aside the difficulty which may be in the words "really present," which do NOT *appear* in the Homily notice, and regarding only those words which *do* appear in the notice, it may be said, I think, to be with Ridley, as with Foxe, that THE *stumbling-block* is in the word *forms*, which word might not unnaturally import, and in the mouths of Romanists was always understood to mean, the outward shows alone, when all the material substance was gone. Only let this doubtfulness be removed, only let it be understood that the word "forms" does not exclude the substance of the elements, and Ridley, it seems, would be content to admit the phrase "under the forms of bread and wine."

(3) I cite next the testimony of Jewel, which is very similar to Ridley's. Thrice Harding quotes against him these words of St. Augustine: "Caro ejus, quam forma panis opertam in sacramento accipimus; et sanguis ejus, quem, sub vini specie et sapore potamus; caro videlicet carnis, et sanguis est sacramentum sanguinis."

On one occasion Harding says: "In these words of St. Augustine we see the flesh of Christ called a sacrament of his flesh, and the blood a sacrament of his blood, inasmuch as they be covered with the form of bread and wine, yet verily and in substance present."

Now, how does Jewel* deal with this argument and this quotation? *First*, he shows that "form" does not imply *absence of substance*. *Then* as to "operta" (covered), he

* After the extracts given in Paper III., pp. 122—135, it is surely needless to adduce evidence here of Jewel's repudiation of the Real Objective Presence.

shows that similar expressions are used, where bodily presence is out of the question. He quotes (among others) St. Gregory, "Christus . . in hoc mysterio moritur," where the gloss saith, "Moritur, id est, mors ejus repræsentatur," (Christ dieth, that is to say, his death is represented.) "Now," says Jewel, "as Christ *dieth in* the sacrament, so is his *body present* in the sacrament. But Christ dieth NOT there REALLY and INDEED; therefore Christ's BODY is NOT THERE VERILY AND INDEED." And he adds, "I thought it needful to use the more examples on this behalf, for that this place of St. Augustine seemeth to carry the greatest force of all others. But as St. Augustine saith here, Christ's body is hidden under the form or kind of bread: even so he saith 'The grace of God lay hidden in the Old Testament.' . . Again St. Augustine saith, 'The New Testament was hidden in the Old.' But he expoundeth himself, 'It was *hidden*, that is to say, it was *secretly signified*.' And thus, by St. Augustine's own words and exposition, we may likewise say, 'Christ's flesh is privily *hidden*, that is to say,' as St. Augustine expoundeth it, 'it is PRIVILY SIGNIFIED.'" And Jewel concludes his argument by saying, "Thus St. Augustine's meaning may well stand upright without any new secrecy or real or fleshly presence." (Harding, Thess. etc., pp. 617—619; see also pp. 796, 797.)

But St. Augustine's meaning, which may thus stand upright, is conveyed in words remarkably like our Homily Notice. St. Augustine says, "We RECEIVE his flesh, covered with the *form* of *bread*, and his *blood under* the *form* and flavour of *wine*." And the words of the notice are "of the due RECEIVING of his blessed body and blood, under the form of bread and wine."

I think, I cannot then be wrong, in saying that, however undesirable it might be thought *now* to use such language

as, in St. Augustine's time, might give no occasion of misunderstanding, yet clearly in Jewel's judgment the words of the Notice "may well stand upright," and that without any "real or fleshly presence."*

(4) Next I will quote from Calvin, who affirms, "In the Supper Christ Jesus, viz., His body and blood, is truly given *under the signs of bread and wine*." † (Inst., iv. 17, § 32.)

I give the words *verbatim* as translated and quoted, with approval, by Jeremy Taylor, who regards them as expressing "OUR sense of the REAL PRESENCE." (Real Presence, I, § 5. Works, Edit. Eden, vol. vi., p. 14.)

And I do this, on purpose that the expression may be seen to bear the seal of approval of an eminent English

* So the learned Dr. Andrew Willet, making an argument against the Carnal Presence from the words of St. Cyprian, [*Panem Angelorum sub Sacramento manducamus*, etc.,] says: "We eat the bread of angels *under a sacrament* in earth; we shall eat the same without a sacrament more manifestly in heaven. The same body shall be eaten in heaven which is eaten in earth, though not after the same manner: but Christ's flesh shall not be eaten in heaven, therefore it is not eaten in earth." (Synopsis Papismi, vol. vi., p. 47. Edit. 1852.)

† "In sacra cœna jubet me sub symbolis panis ac vini corpus ac sanguinem suum sumere, manducare ac bibere, nihil dubito quin et ipse verè porrigat, et ego recipiam."

Elsewhere Calvin says, "Quicquid ad experimendam veram substantialemque Corporis et sanguinis Domini communicationem, quæ sub *sacris cœnæ symbolis* fidelibus exhibatur, facere potest, libenter recipio." (iv., 17, § 19.) And again, "Dico igitur, in cœnæ mysterio *per symbola panis et vini*, Christum vere nobis exhiberi adeoque Corpus et sanquinem ejus." (iv. 17, § 11.)

Yet with this is the clear rejection of the Corporal Presence. He says, "All inventions contrary to this are to be rejected, such as the ubiquity of Christ's body, the *inclosing it under the symbol* of bread, and his substantial presence upon earth." (See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 59.)

prelate—a seal too, set upon it in a treatise* which is most distinct and emphatic in denying and repudiating, and condemning the doctrine of "the Real Presence" in any such sense as that in which it is taught by our opponents.

Here that is said of the *giving*, which in the Notice is said of the *receiving;* and the only difference in expression is the use of the word "signs" instead of "form," which I imagine (the doctrine of transubstantiation being not in question) all will allow to be perfectly immaterial. Indeed in the declaration of the twenty-one clergymen, both these expressions are used as equivalents, or the one as the explanation of the other, for it is there said, "are present . . . . under 'the outward visible part or *sign*' *or* '*form* of bread and wine.'"

(5) My next quotation shall be from "The defence of a certain poor Christian man, who else should have been condemned by the Pope's law." It was translated by Coverdale, and the translation is given in Coverdale's Works (P. S. Edit., "Remains," p. 450, *sqq.*) There it is said, "The memorial of Christ's holy Supper was institute by himself *under both the forms of bread and wine.*" (Page 472.)

And again, a little further, "Christ . . . . did not for nought, or without a cause, ordain this remembrance *under both forms of bread and wine.*"†

* See quotations in Paper III., pp. 134, 135, note; and p. 138, note.

† The same writer says a little further on (p. 473), "The right and wholesome remembrance of the Supper of the Lord, is it that is done *in faith;* namely, when we believe that the body of Christ was given for us, and that his blood was shed for us." And again (p. 470, 471), "Let us look, wherefore they call it a sacrifice. Even because, say they, that in the mass Christ the Son is offered up unto God His Father. Oh, what a great blasphemy is this; yea to be abhorred of all virtuous men. . . . But they will say, 'Christ is not so sacrificed

This language, it will be observed, carries the sanction of both the writer and the translator, neither of whom can be supposed to be supporters of the Corporal Presence.

And here is a saying which will very well justify the phrase of the Notice before us. For if it be right to say that Christ instituted this memorial *under the forms of bread and wine*, and it is not in question that in that memorial we receive the body and blood of Christ, it cannot be in the proper language of the Reformed, incorrect to say that we receive Christ's body and blood "under the form of bread and wine."

(6) The next citation shall be from the examination of William Thorpe, 1407, given in Bales' Works (P. S. Edit., p. 71). "I believe that in the day next before that he would suffer passion on the morn, *in form of bread and wine*, he ordained the sacrament of his flesh and blood, that is, his own precious body, and gave it to his apostles for to eat." A similar phrase is used by Thorpe, as expressive of his belief, in p. 92. But I do not dwell upon these forms of expression as used by Thorpe,* about whose views on this subject we may not be able to speak very certainly. I

in the mass, that he dieth again upon the cross;' but it is for the remembrance of the same sacrifice, that once was made. Why do they then call it a sacrifice, seeing it is but a remembrance of a sacrifice?" It is perfectly clear from these passages that the writer was very far from the views of those who maintain the "Real Objective Presence."

* Thorpe was a priest, suspected to be a Lollard. He was brought up for examination before Archbishop Arundel. Collier says, "His answer, with reference to the holy Eucharist, appears sound and well guarded." (Church History. iii., p. 276.) The point on which his examination turned was *the abiding of the substance of bread.* But it appears that he taught that "for certes the virtue and the

wish only to call attention to the marginal note * or gloss on Thorpe's words, "That is *under the creatures of bread and wine*," as indicating, that thus explained (and the Ritualists would themselves so explain it) the words might be understood in a sense not to be disallowed by the reformed. The words indeed of Thorpe are but just equivalent to the words before cited as translated and allowed by Coverdale.

(7) My next quotation shall be from Bishop Bilson, who while condemning the Papists for *shrouding* Christ "under the forms of bread and wine," and teaching that "the sacrament is not, but only annexed as a sign to the heavenly grace and virtue of Christ mightily present," has the following very observable passage :—

"*Phi.* (*Philander, the Jesuit*) By this place [of the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite] you see Christ is *covered* WITH THE FORMS OF BREAD AND WINE, as with garments, and that is word for word our opinion.

"*Theo.* (*Theophilus, the Christian*) Add συμβολικῶς, *figuratively*, as your author doth, and then both YOUR REAL PRESENCE IS OVERTHROWN, *and the doctrine which we teach clearly established*.† For we confess that Christ worketh in us, and *presenteth*

meed of the most holy sacrament of the altar standeth mickle more in the belief thereof that ye ought to have in your soul, than it doth in the the outward sight thereof." (See Bale's "Select Works," P.S.Edit., p. 91.)

* Which has the authority of both Foxe and Bale. (See Foxe's Acts and Monuments, A.D. 1409, Seeley's Edit., vol. iii., p. 253.)

† So Bishop Lake speaks of "*feeding by faith on Christ* as He *represents Himself* VEILED *in the Church militant*." But Bishop Lake says elsewhere : "Our eating and drinking must not only feed upon Christ's body and blood, but upon them as the one was *broken*, and the other *shed*,—as they were the propitiatory sacrifice." Further evidence, if required, of Bishop Lake's opposition to the Real Objective view may be seen in Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 835—839.

Himself unto us in these mysteries, as it were, in certain *veils and coverings*, which, *mystically*, by way of *signification* and *spiritual operation*, *contain and clothe* His grace and truth: but NOT REALLY, nor by *material or corporal inclusion*, as you affirm; and so Himself expresseth His mind in this very chapter. . . . Christ is SIGNIFIED and *received* by these signs and figures . . . . but that *Christ is locally or substantially closed within the forms of bread and wine* . . . . Dionysius hath no such sense nor words. . . . . signs and figures the ancient fathers* do not take for *shows* and *accidents*, as you do, but for *substantial* and usual *creatures*." (True Difference, etc., Edit. 1585, pages 716, 717.†)

Here we have an author most clearly disallowing both the Romish and Lutheran view, yet declaring that "the doctrine we teach" may be fairly expressed and *established* by the expression covered *with the forms of bread and wine*, understood as they should be understood, *figuratively*. And that because "Christ is signified and *received by these signs*."

* It will be observed that, with Bilson, as with Foxe, and Ridley, and Jewel, *the* stumbling-block (the presence being understood *sacramentally*) is the *doubtfulness* of the phrase in relation to the question of the absence or presence of the substances of the elements. Bilson's repudiation of the "Real Objective Presence" has been, I think, sufficiently shewn in Paper No. III., p. 109, sqq. He says, only a few pages beyond the extract given above: "The sacraments take their force *only* and *wholly* from the word. . . . . Christ cometh and dwelleth in us, as truly by His word as by His sacraments; and if you compare them, more truly by His word than by the *signs* and *seals* of His word." (Page 720.)

† See Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 798, 799.

Clearly then in his view, there could be no question, that there might well be a right and sound understanding of the phrase "received under the form of bread and wine."

(8) Equally conclusive as to the matter before us are the words of Bishop Morton, who in his views of opposition* to the Corporal Presence was in thorough accord with our Reformers. He writes thus:—"In this sacrament . . . . His precious body and blood . . . . conveyed . . . . *under the signs* and seals of *bread and wine* consecrated to that use."† (Catholic Appeal, lib. ii., ch. ii., sec. 28, p. 130.) Clearly then, I think it appears that Bishop Morton, with all his strong repugnance to the doctrine of the Corporal Presence, would have felt no difficulty in accepting the terms of the notice before us.

(9) I may add that Bishop Nicholson, whose views (though he has been quoted in its support) were very clearly‡ opposed to the "Real Objective Presence," has

* See below, note, p. 262.

† The whole passage will be found quoted below, p. 264. Several words are omitted in this extract.

‡ Witness the following, "The word *really*, is diversely taken. For sometimes—1. It is opposed to that which is feigned, and is but imaginary, and imports as much as *truly*. 2. It is opposed to that which is merely figurative, and barely representative, and imports as much as *effectually*. 3. It is opposed to that which is spiritual, and imports as much as *corporally* or *bodily*. We then believe Christ to be present in the Eucharist DIVINELY [*i.e.*, as he had before said *as God*] after a special manner; SPIRITUALLY, *in the hearts of the communicants;* SACRAMENTALLY, or RELATIVELY, *in the elements*. And this presence of his is *real*, in the two former acceptions of *real*, but not in the last, for he is TRULY and EFFECTUALLY there present, though NOT CORPORALLY, BODILY, *carnally, locally*." (Edit. Oxford, 1866, p. 217.)

Again, "Whatsoever Christ hath done already, or hath promised hereafter to do for us, are to us as never done, as never to be done,

sanctioned this same form of expression, as capable of conveying only the notion of a relative Presence. He says, "The Eucharist is a sacrament instituted by Christ *under the elements of bread and wine*, to represent, exhibit, and seal the passion of Christ and the benefits thereof to a worthy communicant." (Exposition of Catechism, Edit., Oxford, 1866, p. 215.)

Again, speaking of the different forms of speech used to express the Eucharistic Presence, he maintains that many expressions used by Lutherans may be understood in a sense not to be objected to. He says, "All the words used by divines in this mystery may receive a candid interpretation, except that of Rome. 1. That Christ is in the sacrament corporally, substantially, and perhaps consubstantially, may have a respect to the subject or supposite, of the *relatum or correlatum*, their meaning no more than that he is *there under the forms of bread and wine, not changed in substance* BUT IN USE; as it is in other relations; as, for example, betwixt a father and a son: who though they relate to each other, yet they remain two distinct substances, and the same they were." (Ibid, p. 216.) Here we have an

till we believe them: *that which gives them a being, and makes them present and existent to us, is our faith.*" (Ibid, p. 223.)

Again, "It is as clear as the sun, that this sacrament is received by, and *only by* THE FAITHFUL. Unbelievers may receive *panem Domini*, the bread of the Lord; *believers* ONLY *panem Dominum*, that bread which is the Lord." (Ibid, p. 225.)

For further evidence, if required, of Bishop Nicholson's views as opposed to the Real Objective Presence, the reader may be referred to pp. 214—225. He appears to be very much of the same mind as Hooker, whose "very pious judgment" he quotes, (p. 215.) He was chosen as one of the Westminster "Assembly of Divines," but did not appear. (See Neal's History of Puritans, vol. ii., p. 209. See also Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 702—704.)

expression certainly not less objectionable than that of the Homily notice, yet certainly not used to express any Real Objective Presence.

(10) To these examples I will add that of Bishop Patrick, who while maintaining that "the REAL PRESENCE IS NOT TO BE SOUGHT IN THE BREAD AND WINE, BUT IN THOSE THAT RECEIVE THEM, according as learned Hooker speaks,"* yet has not hesitated to say that Christ "doth exhibit himself unto us UNDER THESE SHADOWS OF BREAD AND WINE;"† words which certainly so far as they differ from the formula in the notice differ in the way of making it more objectionable. At least it seems absolutely necessary to understand the word *shadows* here as being used in a sense precisely equivalent to *forms* or *signs*, not as having anything *shadowy* in their nature, beyond their *inferior* relation to the higher REALITIES and the correct resemblance which shadows bear to their real substances. Just as we shall presently find our Homily exhorting us so to come to the Lord's table as to receive "not only the outward sacrament, but the spiritual thing also; not the figure, but the truth; not the *shadow* only, but the BODY."

It was in this sense, no doubt, that the bishop used the word. And if so, we have here a phrase which stands exactly on a level with that in the Homily notice. And we know that the writer meant to speak of no Corporal Presence.‡

* Mensa Mystica, ch. v., § iii. 4, p. 90, Edit. 1717.

† Mensa Mystica, ch. v., § iii. 4, p. 87, Edit. 1717. See Goode on Eucharist, vol. ii., pp. 861, 862.

‡ The following passages from Bishop Patrick are here given in case any should desire clearer evidence of his not holding anything like the "Real Objective Presence": "These [elements] are *tokens* of His presence, and represent Him to us, the Spirit, is that

(11) And I may venture here to add yet one other citation from one who with the Reformers stands very distinctly opposed to the Lutheran as well as the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist. I mean Dr. Waterland.* He has said, after

whereby He is present." (Mensa Mystica, p. 87.) "Christ doth not descend *locally* unto us, that we may feed on Him; but as the sun toucheth us by his beams without removing of its sphere, so Christ comes down upon us by the power of the Holy Ghost." (Ibid, p. 87.) "The Spirit of Christ grows unto a greater strength within us as we receive more of heavenly nutriment into our souls. And this is *all that is meant by the* REAL PRESENCE of Christ in this sacrament, which the Church speaks of and believes, as it is one reason, likewise, of the *change* which is so much noised, because by His power these things become effectual to so great purpose when they are holily received. Our Lord doth call these signs by the name of the things they signify, because, in a *spiritual manner*, His body and blood are present to us, viz., by the *communication of* THAT *to us* WHICH THEY DID PURCHASE FOR US." (Ibid, p. 89.) "The *change* is in *our souls* and NOT in the *sacrament*." (Ibid, p. 91.) "If it be *worthily received*, it is the body and blood of Christ; if unworthily, it is *but* BARE *bread and wine*." (Ibid, p. 91.)

Further evidence, if desired, may be found in his later work, "The Christian Sacrifice," part ii., section vi., pp. 50—61. Edit. 1690.

* Waterland's repudiation of the Real Objective Presence is now, I think, generally conceded. Any who may be doubtful on the subject will find evidence in quotations to be given in Paper No. VI. It may suffice here to set down the following: "Luther first, and afterwards Zuinglius, attempted a reform in this article; but it was difficult to clear off the thick darkness all at once; and so neither of them did it to such perfection as might have been wished. One threw off *transubstantiation* very justly, but yet retained I know not what *corporal, local* presence, and, therefore, did not retrench enough: the other threw off withal (or too much neglected) the *spiritual presence* and *spiritual graces:* which was retrenching a great deal too much. [See note in Paper No. I., pp. 35, 36.] It must, however, be owned that apologies have been since made for Zuinglius, as for one that erred in *expression* rather than in real *meaning*, or that

making long quotations from Bishop Barlow and Dean Aldrich, "The sum of all is, that sacramental or symbolical feeding in the Eucharist is feeding upon the body broken and the blood shed, *under the signs or symbols of bread and wine.*"* ("On the Eucharist," chap. viii., Works, vol. iv., p. 607.)

Here we see how naturally a phrase, exactly equivalent to that used in the Homily notice (understanding *form* as equivalent to *signs*), comes up to express the summing up of a view of the Eucharist entirely distinct from and opposed to that of the Real Objective Presence.

corrected his sentiments on second thoughts. And it is certain that his friends and followers, within a while, came into the old and true notion of *spiritual* benefits." (Works, vol. iv., pp. 599, 600.)

"To the Lutherans, who seem to contend for a *mixture* of the *visible* elements with the body *invisible*, we have this to reply, that we readily admit of a *symbolical* delivery, or conveyance, of one by the other; which effectually answers every good end and purpose, as it suits, also, extremely well with the Scripture phraseology in those cases." (Ibid, p. 608.)

"What is a *sacramental union*, with a body *spiritually* present, while *corporally* absent? Or what *ideas* can any one really have under these *terms* more than that of a *mystical* or *moral* union . . . . an union as to *virtue* and *efficacy*, and to all *saving* intents and purposes?" (Ibid, p. 641.)

* So John Owen speaks of "the exhibition of Christ *to the souls of believers*, UNDER THE *outward* SIGNS AND SYMBOLS of bread and wine, by His institution making such a sacramental union between the thing signified and the sign, that the signs remaining to be what they are in themselves, they are unto us the thing that is signified." (Works, Edit. Goold, vol. ix., p. 621.) And, again, he says: "Here is a peculiar way of His exhibition UNDER *outward* SIGNS, and a mysterious reception of Him IN THEM *really*, so as to come to a real substantial incorporation in our souls." (Ibid.)

(12) Yet once more I will go back to cite (by way of explanation) the following passage from Jewel. "M. Harding argueth further, 'Christ's body is so received as it is present; but it is present by bread and wine (ye say); ergo, it is received by bread and wine; to conclude, if by bread and wine, then not by faith only.' If M. Harding had better considered the rules of his old sophistry, he might soon have seen the wants and deformities of this reason. . . . It is true that on our part it is not either our hand or our mouth, but faith only that receiveth the body of Christ; but the same body of Christ *is offered and represented* unto our faith by mean of the sacraments. *We speak* of such instruments of receiving as are *of ourself*, and be within us; *M. Harding answereth* of the sacraments that be *external instruments* and are wholly without us."*

It is to be observed that here we have Jewel's defence of that part of his Apology in which he had said *by them* (i.e. the bread and wine) Christ Himself. . . . is so presently *given* unto us, as that by *faith* we verily *receive* His body and blood."

Harding has been endeavouring, out of Jewel's own mouth, to prove that the reception cannot be by *faith only*. Jewel replies vindicating the truth of reception by faith only, yet acknowledging that in one sense we "receive the body and blood of Christ by bread and wine," and that because "the same body of Christ is *offered and represented* unto our faith *by mean of the sacraments*."

And surely the same reason which is thus given to support the expression "received by bread and wine," would serve equally well to vindicate the not dissimilar expression "received under the form of bread and wine."

* Apology and Defence, p. 487, 488.

Indeed the phrase "received *under the form* of bread and wine" (understood in the sense of "signs of bread and wine") so far as it adds anything to the phrase "received *by* bread and wine" seems to add just that* which in the langague of Jewel's Explanation, the words "*represented* unto our faith" seem to add to the words "*offered* to our faith by mean of the sacraments."

These quotations,† I trust, will be sufficient to establish my point—that the phrase "under the form of bread and wine," and its equivalents, standing in such connexion as that in which they stand in the notice, were not regarded by the Reformers and succeeding Divines‡ (of the same Eucharistic views with our Reformers) as incapable of bearing a sense such as they would have approved,—and that indeed they were sometimes, though not often, actually used by them to express what they would regard as a sound view of Eucharistic doctrine.

But if this be so, then, clearly the phrase in this notice does not bear any stamp which belongs exclusively either to Romish or Lutheran doctrine. It cannot truly be

* See Calvin Inst. iv, 17, § 1. "*Signa* sunt panis et vinum, quæ invisibile alimentum, quod percipimus ex carne et sanguinis Christi, nobis *repræsentant*."

† Dr. Sherlock has spoken of the eye of faith seeing "Christ really *present under the species of bread and wine*." (See Oxford Cantena, p. 129.) But I have not quoted him in the text, because, though I think his Exposition of the Catechism makes it evident that he did not hold the doctrine of those who now teach "The Real Objective Presence," yet his repudiation of a Corporal Presence cannot be said to be so clear and distinct as that of those whose language I have adduced.

‡ The Extracts given will be found to form a *Catena* completely covering the ground from the early Reformation period to the middle of the 18th century.

said to convey of necessity a sense which is opposed to the doctrine of the Reformed. It has been accepted already, and it might (if need were) be accepted and used again by those who deny the Corporal Presence. It might stand even in our Articles of Religion, and there not really be repugnant to, only have its sense somewhat straitly limited by, other Articles whose language is clearly determinate against the Real Objective Presence.

The case, then, I think, may fairly be said to stand thus. The notice at the end of the First Book of Homilies, contains a phrase, which in England was commonly regarded as a phrase of the Romanists. Dr. Pusey has very ably maintained that the words are quite capable of expressing the Lutheran doctrine,* and as a matter of fact were so employed by the Lutherans themselves. I venture a step further, and maintain that the phrase—so far as it is used in the notice—is quite capable of bearing the Reformed sense, and as a matter of fact, was sometimes so used by Reformed Divines themselves, while maintaining their doctrines both against Romanists and Lutherans.

And this is quite sufficient to establish what I wish to prove, that the use of such an expression, even if it came in a book of the highest authority, would have no power to weigh anything against distinct doctrinal statements on the other side.

I do not for a moment admit the doctrinal authority of the notice. But even if the most unquestionable and the most supreme authority could fairly be clamed for it, I contend that the use which is made of it to support the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, must still be an abuse.

* See "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church" p. 18, sqq.

For myself, I wish to state clearly, that I do not *stand* at all upon the arguments I have brought forward as to the *innocence* of the phrase; because in my own view all these arguments are needless. The phrase, I believe, does not come from any utterance of the Church.

But still, I have thought it worth while to show, that if any there are who may feel some suspicion on *this* point, and think the ground I stand upon myself somewhat doubtful or shaky, there is plenty of room for them to stand round about me. And with this view I maintain that the phrase does not necessarily teach *any doctrine*. It is not capable of having any doctrine in fairness fastened on it.

It would indeed, be scarcely true to say of it, what Mr. Stuart says of the word "Mass," that it is as colourless as water, as tasteless as the white of an egg.* The expression has something of a colour, it has indeed something of a taste. You may say that in the colour

* On Low Masses, p. 28. No doubt what Mr. Stuart says of the word "Mass" is quite true; inasmuch as none, I suppose, doubt, that, in its origin, the name was quite *innocent*. But it came to pass, at the time of the Reformation, that what the Reformers did "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ," was quite another, and a different, thing from the memorial sacrifice of the Romish priests. One name would not well serve for both. Therefore our Reformers called their "Lord's Supper" a *Communion*," and left the word "*Mass*" for those who had (in their judgment) no true Lord's Supper at all, but only a violation of the Lord's institution. A name indeed, is of little consequence, except that a confusion of names will lead sometimes to a confusion of things. And the Reformers, who laboured hard to build up the *distinction* of the *things*, would hardly, I think, thank Mr. Stuart for his endeavours to break down the *distinction* of *names*. (See Hook's "Lives of the Archbishops, Series ii. vol. ii., p. 284, note, and p. 216; and Series i., vol. i., p. 25, Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 310—312; and Bulley's Variations, Appendix, No. I., p. 139. Bellarmine, "De Missâ," lib. i., ch. i.)

there is certainly a Romish hue,* and that the taste may have somewhat of a Lutheran flavour. But its colour and its taste are only what it has acquired by standing long in Roman shops and passing on through Lutheran hands. Its substance is older than Luther. It was known long before transubstantiation had its birth. It is, at least, as old as the fifth century. If by none before, the phrase was certainly used, as we have seen, by St. Augustine,† who, on Luther's confession at least, did not teach the Corporal Presence at all. That it should convey the idea of any such Presence, is certainly not owing to anything inherent in itself. Indeed the expression, so far as used in the notice, does not, of necessity, imply any Real Presence at all. *A sacramental*, NOT REAL, presence, in the elements, and a presence of the *res sacramenti* to the faith of the receiver, is all which the terms of the expression can be said at all to require. Dr. Pusey indeed has said, arguing from this notice, "since we receive them (*i.e.* the body and blood of Christ) they *must be* THERE (*i.e.* under the form of bread and wine), in order that we may receive them." ("Presence of Christ," p. 22.)

But when Dr. Pusey wrote these words, he was surely forgetting an illustration not unfrequently used by eminent English Divines (by one in particular whom Dr. Pusey elsewhere cites‡ in support of his own Eucharistic views) I mean that of a legal instrument or deed of conveyance.

* In England the colour was decidedly Romish rather than Lutheran. Evidence of this may easily be found in the writings of our Reformers. Some Extracts to the purpose may be seen in Goode on Eucharist i., p. 43 sqq.; and Supplement, p. 23, 24.)

† See Pusey's "Real Presence from the Fathers," p. 132.

‡ See Bishop Morton on Eucharist: "As though there were not a *truth* in a mystical, and sacramental *deliverance* of Christ his body,

Surely it were nothing strange—no doing violence to the English language, no unnatural form of speech among us—if I were to say that I received an estate under the form of a piece of parchment by which it was conveyed to me.*

except it were by a *corporal*, and material *presence* thereof, which is a transparent falsity, as any may perceive by any Deed of Gift, which by writing, seale, and delivery conveyeth any land or possession from man to man." (Book iv., ch. 1, sect. 22, p. 214.) Again: "A father delivering by politike assurances under hand and seal a portion of land, although an hundred miles distant, and conveying it to his sonne by Deed, if the sonne in scorne should terme the same Deed or writing, blacke inke; the seal, greasie waxe; and the whole act but a *bare signe*, ... Such like have been, your calumnies and opprobious reproaches against our celebration of the Sacrament of Christ." (Ibid. sec, 3., p. 216; see also Catholic Appeal, lib. ii., ch. ii., sec. 28, p. 130, 131.)

Dr. Pusey has quoted in support of his doctrine a passage from Bishop Morton's Catholic Appeal, acknowledging in general terms "a Real Presence." (See "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent, p. 43.) How distinctly Bishop Morton would condemn Dr. Pusey's doctrine the following testing passage will show: "St. Augustine; who for the preservation of the truth of Christ's human nature, will not admit of the presence of a bodie in many places at once: for this is (saith he) 'profanely to destroy the proper nature of a bodie, because the bodie which is not circumscribed in one place, is NO WHAT, because NO WHERE.' Many such sentences might be produced, which CANNOT *be eluded* by that only answer of our adversaries, understanding that Christ is not present on earth and in heaven at one time, to wit *visibly*, or by a natural, but *by a* SUPERNATURAL *manner*, which will be too raw matter for their stomaches, who are accustomed unto the arguments of ancient Fathers, whom they find thus arguing: If Christ (according to His bodily presence) *sit at the right hand of the Father in heaven, then doubtless he is not in the world by the presence of His flesh*." (Catholic Appeal, lib. ii. ch. ii., sec. 19, p. 113.)

* So Dr. Aldrich says "It is easy to conceive, how a thing that is locally *absent* may yet be really *received*,—as we commonly say, a

Surely I might say with perfect propriety that I received £100, under the form of a cheque or a bank-note. And my saying this would certainly not imply that the estate

man receives an estate, or inheritance, when he receives the *Deeds* or *Conveyances* of it.—The *reception* is confessedly *real*, though the thing itself is not *locally* or circumscriptively *present*." (Quoted in Waterland Works. iv., p. 606.) So again "We do not hold that we barely receive the *effects* and benefits of Christ's *body*, but we hold it really *present* in as much as it is *really received*, and we *actually* put in *possession* of it, though *locally* absent from us." (Also quoted in Waterland; Works, iv., p. 607.)

"Variæ sunt investituræ secundum ea quibus investimur: verbi gratia, investitur *canonicus* per *librum*, abbas per *baculum* et *annulum* simul; sicut, inquam, in ejusmodi rebus est, sic et divisiones gratiarum divertis sunt traditæ sacramentis." (St. Bernand as quoted in Waterland, vol. iv., p. 571, note. See Consensus Tigurinus, Edit. 1605. p. 124.)

Archdeacon Churton speaks of "the mischief of such modes of illustration." (Preface to Waterland's Letters, p. 13. Parker, 1868.)

No doubt they are very damaging to "The Real Objective Presence." But they certainly were not peculiar to "English Divines of the period which followed the Revolution." (Ibid, p. 14.) And however they fall short of conveying *the whole truth*, they have certainly not been accounted mischievous by our Reformers or their successors.

Bishop Cosin says, "The truth of the words of Christ remains constant, and can be defended, without overthrowing so many other great truths. Suppose a testator puts deeds and titles in the hand of his heir with these words, 'Take the house which I bequeath thee;' there is no man will think that those writings and parchments are that very house, which is made of wood and stones; and yet no man will say that the testator spake falsely or obscurely. Likewise our blessed Saviour, having sanctified the elements by His words and prayers, gave them to His disciples as seals of the New Testament; whereby they were as certainly secured of those rich and precious legacies which He left to them, as children are of their fathers lands and inheritance by deeds and instruments signed and delivered for that purpose." (History of Transubstantiation, ch. v., Sect. 5., Edit. Oxford, p. 180.)

was brought into the room with the parchment to be signed,* or that the amount of gold was there wrapped up within the note, or present at all under the form of the draft. And why then must the phrase "received under the form of bread and wine," (when we know that similar forms of expression were used by those who denied the docrine,) be held to teach of necessity the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence?

III. If I have carried my readers with me thus far, I have little fear of their dissenting from my third proposition, that the way is clear for an unbiassed examination of the Homily itself, that it may bear witness what the doctrine of the Book of Homilies really is on the question before us.

The phrase we have been considering is quite capable of being explained and understood in what the Reformed party surely would call a sound sense. The same phrase in a

* It is not to be supposed that the similitude of a legal document is used by our Divines as able to express the full truth of the blessings conveyed by the sacrament. Bishop Morton says, "In this sacrament the donor is Christ, the gift is His precious bodie and bloud, the high ransom of man's redemption, conveyed unto mankind by the word and sacrament, as by a visible Deed of Gift *under the signs and seals of* common elements of bread and wine, consecrated to that use; the right receiver is the penitent and faithful communicant. This similitude *agreeth for the manner*, albeit for the EFFECTUALNESS of the manner we say, that the ods be is lesse than heaven and earth. For by this faithful participation, there is wrought in the godly Christian an ineffable and incomprehensible union and conjunction through faith with the humanitie of Christ his Redeemer; whereby he is also made partaker of the Divine nature." (Catholic Appeal, lib. ii., ch. ii., sec. 28, p. 130, 131.) Compare Bullinger's Decades, v., 321. "This must not be dissembled of us, that sacraments have a greater and more effectual force than any sealed charters can have."

more questionable connexion, as applied to the Presence, was repudiated by Cranmer on behalf of the English Prayer Book. But the phrase as used in the notice does not imply any real presence under the forms of bread and wine.

Yet (lest doubtless it should seem to carry any Popish or Lutheran sound) it is, when the Second Book of Homilies comes forth, rejected, and another title with no such suspicious or doubtful sound substituted for it. What conclusion are we to draw from this? Surely not that the Church of England has deliberately retained a form of expression which shews that she desired to teach her children the Corporal Presence. Rather, I think, we should say, that here seems to be evidence of the care and vigilance, and wise caution of our Church, in that a form of expression*—however capable of a sound sense—was deliberately rejected, lest, perchance, an unsound sense should afterwards be nailed upon it. It is, indeed, somewhat curious, certainly it strikes one as very needless, that at the end of the First Book of Homilies, this promissory notice of a Second Book to be issued should continue to stand after the promise has been fulfilled, and the Second Book had been published—that still it should be said "Hereafter shall follow etc.," when there remained no more to follow now, since the *Second* Book had been added to the *First*.

But from whatever cause, it *has* stood: and, but for the mistaken argument which has so strangely been fastened on it, we might be *thankful* that it *has* stood.

* Canon Trevor says, "It is clear that its *removal* from the title of the Homily was a designed repudiation of the words, as involving the Corporal Presence, which Cranmer was at first inclined to retain in the Lutheran explanation." (Sacrifice and Participation, p. 91.)

If, as some seem to think, the reprinting of the notice rests on no higher authority than that of the king's* printer, then we might thank the king's printer for reprinting that which seems clearly to show the determination of our Reforming authorities to reject every vestige of the doctrine of a Corporal Presence. If it had not been reprinted, we should, indeed, have had a Homily most full of sound doctrine, and with a title to which none can take exception. But we should not have known that that title was designedly substituted for another under which the Homily was promised, which other might have seemed to imply a doctrine which the Homily does not teach, and which the Authors of the Second Book of Homilies were resolved that they would not in any way seem even to sanction.

I submit, then, that viewed in relation to the date and history of the publication, and to the change of title and to the doctrine taught in the Homily, the only argument which can fairly be built on the notice is an argument *not for* but *against* the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence—an argument (and a very forcible one) not of its deliberate acceptance by our ecclesiastical authorities, but of their jealous care to eliminate from our authorised books every phrase on which such a doctrine might anyways be grafted.

With the way thus made clear before us, what remains will be easy.

There will be no difficulty now in showing (1) That the Homily teaches nothing but what is in full accord with the

* See Goode on Euch. i., 41; Trevor's "Sacrifice and Particapation" p. 90. It seems questionable whether it may not be fairly alleged as weighing considerably against the view of the sole authority of the printer, that the notice is evidently alluded to in the title to the Second Book which reads thus, "The Second Tome of Homilies of such matters as were *promised and entituled* in the former part of Homilies."

views of the Reformed. (2) That the Homily teaches much which is directly repugnant to the teaching of those who maintain the Real Objective Presence.

(1) There is indeed one passage from the Homily which has sometimes been quoted on the other side, and claimed as looking like a support of the doctrine in question. But it would be strange indeed if a book of Homilies put forth with authority at a time when, in the judgment of our opponents, theology had reached about its* *lowest level* in the Church of England, should be found to be really teaching doctrine which on such a subject as the Real Presence, would raise her theology to a level with the Church of Rome. Of the passage referred to it will be no hard task to shew, that it simply speaks the language of some of the chiefest opponents of the Corporal Presence.

The passage alluded to is as follows: "Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent. But, as the Scripture saith, the table of Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of His death, yea, the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ), is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality. The true understanding of this fruition and union, which is betwixt the body and the head, betwixt the true believers and Christ, the ancient Catholic Fathers both perceiving themselves,

* See Christian Remembrancer, p. 188, Jan. 1866.

and commending to their people, were not afraid to call this supper, some of them the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death; other, a deifical communion; other, the sweet dainties of our Saviour, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection; other, the food of immortality, the healthful grace and the conservatory to everlasting life," p. 398.

But what, we may ask, is there here to support the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence? Is it the earnest claiming for the Lord's Supper that it should be regarded as no "vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent?" But is it not possible* for us to reject the "Real Presence" of Rome and yet at the same time to contend earnestly for all the fulness of the blessings of the Lord's Supper, to repudiate the emptying it of the riches of a present Saviour, to protest against its being reduced to bare signs? Is it not possible for us, I ask, to do this? At any rate, we thank God it was constantly done by our Reformers.

They were continually being accused by the Papists of

* "Luther uttered many things very passionately against Zuinglius and others, conceiving that they made the sacraments to be nothing, but only notes distinctive, serving to put difference between Christians and such as are no Christians, as a monk's cow distinguisheth a monk from him that is no monk, or empty signs without all presence of grace, and exhibition of the things they signify. But if he had fully understood the meaning of them he was so violently opposite unto, he would not have censured them so hardly as he did." (Dean Field "Of the Church," E. H. S. Edi vol. iv., p. 410.) It seems doubtful, however, whether Dean Fiel estimated aright the point to which High Lutheran doctrine attained See Pusey, "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p 166, sqq., and Goode "On Eucharist," ii, p. 840.)

making the sacrament nothing but a vain ceremony; and they were continually denying the accusation.* They disclaimed and disowned any such views. Such repudiation comes up almost as from one mouth and with body of voice from the hearts of our Reformers: and that often in almost the same breath with the clearest and strongest statements against the Corporal Presence.

Witness Tyndall:

"That the bread and wine be *no* PROFANE COMMON *signs*, but HOLY *sacraments*, reverently to be considered, and received with a deep faith and remembrance of Christ's death, and of the shedding of His blood for our sins; those sensible things to represent us the very body and blood of

* I venture to quote here the following passage from Dean Goode, since those who write in favour of the Real Objective Presence, still seem to regard every other view as leaving the Ordinance empty and void.

"The misconception under which the authors under review appear to labor is, that there is no medium between holding their doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, and maintaining that there is only in that rite a mere exercise of faith in Christ's sacrifice. A more remarkable and groundless misconception could not exist. The real doctrine which they have to meet is this:—that the elements after consecration are holy, and that they are not mere inoperative and inefficacious signs, but that through the Divine appointment and blessing they are means and instruments through the reception of which God gives to the faithful recipient the things themselves of which they are the signs; but that while the signs are given by man to the mouth, the things signified are given by God to the soul; and are as verily and indeed given to and received by the soul as the signs are given to and received by the body; but of course in that spiritual manner which is suitable for such a communication, which differs altogether from the manner in which a thing is given to and received by the bodily mouth." (Goode on Eucharist i., p. 748, 749.)

Christ, so that while every man beholdeth with his corporal eye those sensible sacraments, the inward eye of his faith may see, and believe stedfastly, Christ offered and dying upon the cross for his sins, how His body was broken and His blood shed for us, and hath given Himself whole for us, Himself to be all ours, and whatsoever He did to serve us, as to be made for us, of His Father, our righteousness, our wisdom, holiness, redemption, satisfaction." (Answer to More, P. S. Edit., p. 265, 266.)

Witness Cranmer:

"Although the sacramental tokens be only significations and figures, yet doth Almighty God *effectually work*, in them that duly receive His sacraments, those *divine and celestial operations* which he hath promised, and by the sacraments be signified. For else they were VAIN *and* UNFRUITFUL *sacraments*, as well to the godly as to the ungodly. And therefore I never said of the whole supper, that it is but a signification or a bare memory of Christ's death; but I teach that it is a SPIRITUAL REFRESHING, *wherein our souls be fed and nourished with Christ's* VERY FLESH AND BLOOD *to eternal life.* And therefore bring you forth some place in my book, where I say that the Lord's Supper is *but a* BARE SIGNIFICATION without *any effect or operation of God* in the same; or else eat your words again, and knowledge that you untruly report me." (On Lord's Supper, p. 148.)

Witness Ridley:

"'Sir,' quoth I, 'methinks it is not charitably done, to

bear the people in hand that any man doth so lightly esteem the sacrament, as to make of it BUT A FIGURE. For that maketh it (but) a BARE FIGURE *without any more profit*; which that book (*i.e.* Cranmer's Book) doth often deny as appeareth to the reader most plainly. 'Yes,' quoth he, 'that they do.' 'Sir, no,' quoth I, 'of a truth: and as for me, I ensure you I make *no less of the sacrament than thus:* I say, whosoever receiveth the sacrament, he receiveth therewith LIFE OR DEATH.'" (Works, P. S. Edit. p. 161.)

And again:

"Think not..... that I go about to take away the TRUE PRESENCE of CHRIST'S BODY *in His Supper* rightly and duly ministered, which is grounded npon the word of God, and made more plain by the commentaries of the faithful fathers. *They that think so of me*, THE LORD KNOWETH HOW FAR THEY ARE DECEIVED." (Ibid, 201.)

Witness Latimer:

"There is none other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence..... And the same presence may be called A REAL PRESENCE, [because to the faithful believer there is the *real or spiritual body of Christ:*] which thing I here rehearse, lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me, with the anabaptist, to make *nothing else* of the sacrament but a BARE AND NAKED SIGN. As for that which is feigned of many, I, for my part, take it for a Papistical invention. And therefore I think it utterly to be rejected from among God's children, that seek their Saviour in faith;

and be taught among the fleshly Papists, that will be again under the yoke of antichrist." (Remains, p. 252.)

And again:

"In all ages the devil hath stirred up some light heads to esteem the sacraments but lightly, as to be EMPTY and BARE SIGNS; whom the fathers have resisted so fiercely, that in their fervour they seem, in sound of word's, to run too far the other way, and to give too much to the sacraments, when they did think more measureably." (In Ridley's Works, p. 115.)

Witness Bradford (and let it be remembered that he was *burnt for maintaining* with a denial of transubstantiation—that an evil man doth not receive the body of Christ "in forma panis.")

"Away with transubstantiation. But here, lest we should make it no sacrament—for a sacrament consisteth of two things,—and lest a man should by this gather that we make it none other thing but BARE BREAD and a NAKED SIGN, and so rail at their pleasure on us, ... I will now speak a little more hereabout by God's grace, to stop their mouths. .... In that He speaketh so plainly, saying, THIS IS MY BODY, who can, may, or dare be so bold as to doubt of it? 'He is the truth' and cannot lie: He is omnipotent and can do all things: therefore it IS HIS BODY. This I believe, this I confess, and pray you all heartily to BEWARE *of these and such like words, that it is* BUT A SIGN OR A FIGURE *of His* BODY; except you will discern betwixt signs which

signify only, and signs which also do represent, confirm, and seal up, or (as a man may say) give with their signification." (Sermons, etc., pp. 92—4.)

Again:

"In the Lord's Supper the bread is called a 'partaking of the Lord's body,' and NOT ONLY A BARE SIGN *of the* BODY of THE LORD..... I would wish that this sacrament should be esteemed and called of Christian men, after Christ's words, namely 'CHRIST'S BODY,' and the wine 'CHRIST'S BLOOD,' rather than otherwise. Not that I mean any other presence of Christ's body than a presence by grace, a presence by faith, a presence spiritually, and not corporally, really, naturally, and carnally, as the Papists do mean; for in such sort Christ's body is only, in heaven, on the right hand of God the Father Almighty, whither our faith in the use of the sacrament ascendeth, and receiveth whole Christ accordingly."* (Ibid, pp. 94, 95.)

Again:

"All the which sayings of the fathers do confirm this our faith and doctrine of the sacrament; we granting in all things hereinunto them, and they in like manner unto us. And therefore the lying lips which both belie the doctors, as though they granted a carnal and real presence of Christ's

* Bradford did not hesitate to write, "The contempt of the sacrament in the days of King Edward hath caused these plagues upon us presently. The Lord be merciful unto us! Amen." (Sermons, etc., p. 96.)

body, naturally and corporally, after the Papist's declaration and meaning, and which belie us also, as though we DENIED ALL PRESENCE OF CHRIST, and so *made it but a* BARE SIGN; these lying lips the Lord will destroy, if they repent not, and with us teach not the truth, and that sacrament is a food of the soul, a matter of faith, and therefore spiritually and by faith to be talked of and understand." (Ibid, pp. 98, 99.)

Witness Hooper:

"I believe . . . the holy sacraments (which are the second mark or badge of the true Church) to be the signs of the reconciliation and great atonement made between God and us through Jesus Christ. They are seals of the Lord's promises, and are outward and visible pledges and gages of the inward faith, and are in number only twain, that is to say, baptism and the holy Supper of the Lord. The which two are *not* VOID *and* EMPTY, *signs, but* FULL; that is to say, they are not only signs, whereby something is signified, but also they are *such signs* as *do exhibit and give* the thing that they signify indeed." (Later Writings, p. 45.)

Witness Jewel:

"In speaking thus we mean not to abase the Lord's Supper, or to teach that it is but a COLD CEREMONY ONLY, and *nothing to be wrought* therein (as many FALSELY SLANDER US we teach). For we affirm that CHRIST doth TRULY and PRESENTLY GIVE HIMSELF WHOLLY *in His sacraments,* in baptism that we may put Him on; and in His supper, that we may eat Him by faith and spirit, and may have

everlasting life by His cross and blood. And we say not this is done SLIGHTLY or COLDLY, but EFFCTUALLY and truly For, although we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, yet we hold Him fast and eat Him by faith, by understanding, and by spirit. And it is no vain faith that comprehendeth Christ; neither is it received with cold devotion that is received with understanding, faith, and spirit. For CHRIST HIMSELF altogether is SO OFFERED and GIVEN US in these mysteries, that we may CERTAINLY KNOW we be 'FLESH OF HIS FLESH, and BONE OF HIS BONES, and that Christ continueth in us, and we in Him.'" (Apol. and Defence, p. 523.)

Again:

"Whereas M. Harding, as well herein, as also in the rest, untruly and *unjustly defameth* us, as making the sacraments of Christ nothing else but BARE TOKENS; let him well understand that we do both think and speak soberly and reverently of Christ's sacraments, as knowing them to be the testimonies of God's promises, and the instruments of the Holy Ghost. And, as we make not the sacrament of baptism bare water, notwithstanding the nature and substance of water remain still; so we make not the sacrament of Christ's body and blood bare bread and wine. We use the same words and definitions that St. Augustine and other ancient fathers . . . have used before us." (Sermon and Harding, p. 515.)

Again:

"Whereas M. Harding thus *unjustly reporteth* of us, that we maintain a NAKED FIGURE and a BARE SIGN or TOKEN only, and nothing else; if he be of God, he knoweth well he should not thus bestow his tongue or hand to *bear false witness*. It is written: 'God will destroy them all that speak untruth.' He knoweth well we *feed* NOT the people of God with BARE SIGNS and FIGURES, but teach them that the sacraments of Christ be holy mysteries, and that in the ministration thereof Christ is set before us even as he was crucified upon the cross; and that therein we may behold the remission of our sins, and our reconciliation unto God; and, as Chrysostom briefly saith, 'Christ's great benefit, and our salvation.' Herein we teach the people, not that a NAKED SIGN OR TOKEN, but that CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD INDEED AND verily is GIVEN UNTO us; that we verily eat it; that we verily drink it; that we verily be relieved and live by it; that we are bones of His bones, and flesh of His flesh; that Christ dwelleth in us, and we in him." (Sermon and Harding, p. 448.)

Witness Hooker:

"We take not baptism nor the Eucharist for bare *resemblances* or memorials of things absent, neither for *naked signs* and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual whereby God when we take the sacraments delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the

sacraments represent or signify." (Edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 258.)

Again:

"It GREATLY OFFENDETH, that some, when they labour to show the use of the Holy Sacraments, assign unto them no end but only TO TEACH the mind, by other senses, that which the word doth teach by hearing." (Ibid, p. 255.)

Again:

"It seemeth therefore MUCH AMISS that against them whom they term Sacramentaries *so many invective discourses are made* all running upon two points, that the Eucharist is not A BARE SIGN OR FIGURE ONLY, and that the EFFICACY OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD IS NOT ALL WE RECEIVE in this sacrament. For no man having read their books and writings which are thus traduced can be ignorant that both these assertions they *plainly confess to be most true.* They do not so interpret the words of Christ as if the name of His body did import but the *figure of His body*, and to be were only to *signify His blood.* They grant that these holy mysteries received in due manner do instrumentally both *make us partakers* of *the grace of that body and blood* which were given for the life of the world, and besides also *impart unto us* even in *true and real* though *mystical manner* the VERY PERSON OF OUR LORD HIMSELF, WHOLE, PERFECT AND ENTIRE, as hath been shewed." (Ibid, p. 355.)

Witness Becon:

"O the inestimable treasures that lie bent out in this most holy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ for the faithful! Blessed is he that is a faithful guest of this celestial table. Blessed is he that with a pure faith and sincere charity eateth the body of his Lord. Blessed is that man which receiveth this most honourable sacrament with an undefiled conscience; for Satan, sin, death, hell, desperation, etc., shall not prevail against him. Such one may be sure to dwell in Christ and Christ in him. Such one may be sure to have his heart abundantly enforced with celestial graces and heavenly gifts. Such one may be sure to have God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost dwelling perpetually in his breast. When ye have done these things aforesaid, then draw nigh, when time requireth, with all humble and reverent fear unto the feast of the Lord's body." (Early Writings, p. 119.)

Witness Willet:

"In the Eucharist, the death of Christ with the fruit thereof, which is the remission of sins, is *not only represented*, but *exhibited* also and *applied:* for otherwise they will make it but a BARE AND NAKED SIGN, if it should only represent and signify.....Wherefore I thus urge them, as Christ's blood is present, so is the fruit of His blood: but His blood is not present only in signification, but verily and indeed to the worthy receiver: *ergo*, so is remission of sins, which is the fruit of His blood." ("Synopsis Papisimi," Edit. 1852, vol. v., pp. 280, 281.)

With these testimonies from our Reformers compare the following from Bullinger:

"They object, I know well enough, against these things that we do evacuate and make of none effect the sacraments, and that we teach that the faithful receive in them or by them, nothing but bare water and bare bread and wine; and that by that means God by us is accused of falsehood and lying. We briefly answer; if they set void or empty things (as I may so say) against full things so as they be void or empty which have not the things themselves included in them; truly, I had rather confess them to be void than full. But if they call them void or empty, and mean profane or unholy things, that is to say, which differ nothing from profane signs; if by bare they understand things of no force, we openly profess that we have sacraments which are holy and not profane, *effectual and not without force; garnished from above,* not naked; and *therefore full, not void or empty.* For they are holy things and not profane, because they are instituted of God, and for godly men, not for profane persons. They are *effectual* and *not without force;* for in the church with the godly and faithful *they work the same effect and end whereunto they* are *ordained* of God; whereof more hereafter. They are also worthily said to be beautified and adorned by God, and not bare things, which have the word of God itself wherewith they are most beautifully adorned. And therefore also they are

full, and not empty sacraments, because they *have those things which make a perfect sacrament."** (Decades v., 313, 314.)

Now what is there in the teaching and testimony quoted from the Homily which we have not in the teaching and testimony here quoted from the Reformers? And that the teaching and testimony of the Homily is to be understood in no higher sense than the similar teaching of the Reformers is made quite clear I think by the following words which follow immediately after the passage quoted.

"All which sayings both of the Holy Scripture and godly men, truly attributed to this celestial banquet and feast, if we would often call to mind, O how would they inflame our hearts to desire the participation of these mysteries, and oftentimes to covet after this bread, continually to thirst for this food! NOT *as* SPECIALLY *regarding the* TERRENE *and* EARTHLY CREATURES which remain; but always holding fast and CLEAVING BY FAITH to THE ROCK,

* Calvin says, "I have a hundred times disclaimed the receiving only of a figure in this sacrament." And again, "Our Catechism teacheth not only a signification of the benefits of Christ to be had herein, but also a participation of the substance of Christ's flesh in our souls." (Quoted in Morton on Eucharist, v., ch. 1, Sect. 2, p. 309.)

The following is from the "Consensus Tigurinus":—

"Cur ex Zuinglii et Calvini nomine potissimum conflata invidia, tam odiose et obstinate exagitantur, nullo maledicendi fine, nec modo? Cum satis abunde jam constet, *non* NUDA *aut* VACUA in sacramentis signa, neque etiam quamlibet vulgarem, aut inanem significationem statui, sed in mysterii virtute efficacem, utpote, quæ in veritate verbi et promissionis significatæ rei exhibitionem et obsignationem conjunctam habeat." ("Consensus Tigurinus," Edit. 1605, p. 134.)

whence we may suck the sweetness of everlasting salvation. And to be brief, thus much more the faithful see, hear, and know the *favourable* MERCIES *of God* SEALED, the SATISFACTION by Christ towards us CONFIRMED, and THE REMISSION of SIN ESTABLISHED." (Pages 398, 399.)

There is nothing else I think, in the Homily which need require one word to be said for the purpose of removing any seeming difficulty. Is there nothing then, at all in the Homily which can be said to look like the teaching of the Real Objective Presence? Most emphatically it may be answered "No." What may be called the "highest teaching" of the Homily, is nothing more than can easily be matched from the writings of those who most clearly and strongly opposed everything like such a doctrine.

(2) It only remains now to bring evidence that the Homily does contain that which is repugnant to the doctrine of those who maintain the Real Objective Presence.

For this purpose the following Extracts will suffice :—

I.

"Our loving Saviour hath ordained and established the REMEMBRANCE of His great MERCY expressed in His PASSION in the institution of His heavenly supper, where every one of us must be GUESTS and NOT GAZERS, EATERS and NOT LOOKERS, FEEDING OURSELVES, and NOT *hiring other to eat for us*, that we may live by our own meat, and not perish for hunger whiles other devour all. To this His commandment forceth us, saying do ye this; drink ye all of this. To

this His promise enticeth, This is my body, which is given for you; this is my blood which is shed for you. So then of necessity we must be *ourselves* PARTAKERS OF THIS TABLE, *and* NOT BEHOLDERS *of other.*" (Pages 395, 396.)

II.

"Neither can he be devout, that otherwise doth presume than it was given by the author. We must then take heed, lest OF THE MEMORY IT BE MADE A SACRIFICE, lest of a COMMUNION it be made a *private eating,* lest of two parts we have but one, lest *applying it for the dead,* we *lose the fruit that be alive.*" (Page 396.)

III.

"Now it followeth *to have with this knowledge* a *sure and* CONSTANT FAITH, *not only that the death of Christ is available* for the redemption of all the world, for the remission of sin and reconciliation with God the Father; but also *that He hath made upon His cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for* THEE, a *perfect cleansing of* THY *sins,* so that thou acknowledgest no other Saviour, redeemer, mediator, advocate, intercessor, but Christ only, and that thou mayest say with the apostle, that *He loved* THEE, and *gave Himself for* THEE. For this is to stick fast to Christ's promise made in His institution, TO MAKE CHRIST THINE OWN and to APPLY HIS MERITS UNTO THYSELF. Herein thou needest NO OTHER MAN'S HELP, NO OTHER SACRIFICE OR

OBLATION, NO SACRIFICING PRIEST, *no* MASS, *no means established by man's invention.* That FAITH is a NECESSARY INSTRUMENT in all these holy ceremonies, we may thus assure ourselves, for that, as St. Paul saith, without faith it is impossible to please God." (Page 399.)

IV.

"It is well known that the meat we seek for in this supper is spiritual food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection, and not earthly; an invisible meat, and not bodily; a ghostly substance, and not carnal; so that *to think that* WITHOUT FAITH *we* MAY ENJOY the EATING AND DRINKING THEREOF, or that that is the fruition of it, is but to dream a GROSS CARNAL FEEDING *basely objecting and* BINDING OURSELVES TO THE ELEMENTS AND CREATURES. Whereas, by the advice of the Council of Nicene we ought to lift up our minds by faith, and leaving these inferior and earthly things, there seek it where the sun of righteousness ever shineth. Take then this lesson O thou that art desirous of this table, of Emissenus, a godly father, that when thou goest up to the reverend communion, to be satisfied with spiritual meats, thou LOOK UP WITH FAITH upon the *holy body and blood of thy God*, thou marvel with reverence, thou *touch it with the mind*, thou receive it with the *hand of thy* heart, and thou take it fully with thy inward man." (Pages 399, 100.)

v.

"The *unbelievers* and *faithless* CANNOT *feed upon that precious body.* Whereas the *faithful* have their life, their abiding in Him, their union, and as it were their incorporation with Him. Wherefore let us prove and try ourselves unfeignedly without flattering ourselves, whether we be plants of the fruitful olive, living branches of the true vine, members indeed of Christ's mystical body, whether God hath purified our hearts by faith, to the sincere acknowledging of His gospel and embracing of His mercies in Christ Jesus; so that at this His table we receive *not only the outward sacrament,* but THE SPIRITUAL THING also, not *the figure, but* THE TRUTH; not the *shadow only, but* THE BODY; not to death, but to life; not to destruction, but to salvation; which God grant us to do through the merits of our Lord and Saviour; to whom be all honour and glory for ever." (Page 400.)

To these extracts from the Homily "Concerning the Sacrament," we may add yet another from "The Second Part of the Sermon for Whitsunday."

VI.

"Now if we will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is presently, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd; you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true Church, that nothing can be more. For

neither are they built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesu; neither yet do they order the sacraments or else the ecclesiastical keys, in such sort as He did first institute and ordain them: but have so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away, that now they seem to be converted into a new guise. Christ commended to His Church *a* SACRAMENT *of His body and blood: they have* CHANGED *it into a* SACRIFICE *for the quick and the dead.*" (Page 414.)

Strained attempts may be made to fasten on some of these passages something else than their natural meaning. But, as a whole, they may be safely left to speak for themselves as to the question before us.

Those who read them carefully will not long hesitate as to which side of the controversy they fairly belong to.

Those who have any aquaintance with the teaching of the Ritualists will be ready to pronounce at once, "This is not the language of those who now teach the Real Objective Presence."

Since writing this Paper, I have seen the valuable Charge of the Bishop of Llandaff (Rivingtons, 1869), from which I extract the following as an additional support to my argument concerning the words of the Notice appended to the First Book of Homilies:—

"Even if these words were authorised by the compilers of the Second Book of Homilies, considering the distinct and explicit declarations of their sentiments . . . . . we may fairly conclude that

they retained them in the belief that they were as capable of application to their own view of the Real Presence, as they had before been used to represent Transubstantiation, or as they might have been to express the Objective Presence, if any one had then propounded that opinion. Mr. Keble (p. 158) quotes from Bertram, or Ratramn, who is known to have influenced Ridley's opinions, and through him those of Cranmer, 'Sub velamento corporei Panis corporeique Vini spirituale Corpus spiritualisque Sanguis existit;' but he also quotes from the same writer, 'Panis ille vinumque *figurate* Corpus et Sanguis existit.' If the strong expression of the first sentence may be explained by the *figurate* of the second, there is no reason why the words of this notice may not be interpreted by language elsewhere employed in reference to the same subject. The Reformers may well have understood and used the words *figurate*, and deemed them to have a sense in harmony with their own convictions.

"The notice, moreover, is so expressed that we are under no necessity of supposing it to imply that the Body and Blood of Christ are in themselves in any sense whatever under the form of Bread and Wine." (Page 147.)

And I may add that the use of expressions such as Bertram's "sub velamento" is common to those whose repudiation of the Real Objective Presence is beyond question. It is used, for example, by the Puritan Sibbes; "*Under these veils* is signified, and more than that, exhibited unto us, the body and blood of Christ Jesus." (Works. Nichol's Edit., X., vol. iv., p. 61. See above, p. 250, and note.)

So Bishop Patrick says: "The sacraments being not unfitly called by an ancient writer *the garments that are cast about our Saviour*, and it being the profession of divines to labour to see the naked face of Truth, it is most worthy our pains to open and reveal those secrets that lie hid and *vailed under symbols and sensible things*." ("Mensa Mystica," Introduction, Sect. I.)

The reader may also be asked to compare the following words of Bishop Jeremy Taylor:—"When things *spiritual* are SIGNIFIED by *materials*, the *thing* UNDER *the figure* is called *true*, and the material part is opposed to it as less true or real," (Real Presence, Sect. I., 6, vol. vi., p. 14, Edit. Eden,)—where, in the Bishop's sense, "*the things under*" are *not* UNDER at all in *real* being, but in signification only, as is abundantly clear from the examples in the context. "The examples of *this*," he goes on to say, "are not infrequent in Scripture.

The tabernacle into which the high priest entered was a type, or a figure of heaven. Heaven itself is called σκηνὴ ἀληθινὴ, 'the *true* tabernacle'; and yet the other was the *material* part." So that, among the unseen realities which, in the Bishop's language, are said to be *under* material shadows, *heaven is* UNDER *the holy of holies:* and it needs no argument to shew that *this* must be NOT in *presence*, but in *signification*.

The *material signs*, in such language, are as *veils* to the true but invisible *things signified*, which, in such language, are said to be *under* them, because *signified* and *exhibited* by them.

Just as we have seen Foxe speaking of the *res sacramenti* as being "UNDER *the forms*" (or material elements); though, certainly, in his view, NOT *under* them at all in *real presence*, but only in the way of sacramental *signification* and *conveyance*.

In connexion with this, let me be allowed to fortify my argument yet further by reference to the language of what is commonly known as Cranmer's Catechism. From the German it was translated into Latin by Justus Jonas; and from the Latin version an English translation was made under Cranmer's direction. The English translation of this was published in 1548; and Cranmer always owned to the responsibility of this. The Catechism has a Lutheran sound; and its Lutheran origin, I believe, is not questioned. (See Burton's Preface to Oxford Edition, p. xxi.) It is to be observed, however, that some of the expressions most objectionable in the Latin, are altered in the English translation. Thus the "sacramentum altaris" (p. 181, Edit. Oxford,) of the Latin, is "the Communion or Lord's Supper," in the English (p. 213, Edit. Oxford). And instead of the Latin "Credere debemus, quod vere corpus et sanguis ejus sit," (p. 177) we have in the English "We ought to believe that in the sacrament we receive truly the body and blood of Christ." (Page 208. See Preface, pp. xviii., xxii.) In like manner a plate, representing an altar with candles, and "priest apparelled after the old sort," was "left out." (See Cranmer "On Lord's Supper," P. S. Edit., p. 227.)

Now the design of such changes is, I think, sufficiently apparent. And, though Cranmer acknowledged that not long before the publication of this Catechism he had been in the *error of the Real Presence* (On Lord's Supper, P. S. Edit., p. 374); yet he always maintained that the language of this Catechism was defensible. He declares it was *untruly* reported, that he "in that book did set forth

the real presence of Christ's body in the sacrament," (p. 374). He said that his saying there "ignorant persons (not used to read *old ancient authors*, nor acquainted with *their phrase and manner of speech*) did carp and reprehend, for *lack of good understanding*," (p. 226.) He declares, "In that Catechism I teach not (as you do) that the body and blood of Christ is contained in the sacrament reserved, but that in the *ministration* thereof *we receive* the body and blood of Christ, whereunto if it may please you to add or understand this word 'spiritually' then is the *doctrine* of my Catechism *sound and good* in all men's ears, which know the true doctrine of the sacraments." (On Lord's Supper, P. S. Edit., p. 227. See note in Remains, p. 218; and Burton's Preface, pp. 17—21.)

Yet, let it be well observed, in the Latin of this Catechism we have the words "est verum corpus, et verus sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, *sub pane et vino*, nobis Christianis ad edendum et bibendum ab ipso Christo institutum," (p. 181.) And the English given for this is as follows: "It is the true body and true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was ordained by Christ Himself, to be eaten and drunken of Christian people, *under the form of bread and wine*." (Page 213. Compare Calvin as quoted above, p. 247, note.)

Is not the conclusion inevitable, that Cranmer did not regard such language as incapable of a reformed sense? While altering another expression only two lines above, he lets this expression stand; and, not only so, but subsequently he defends the language and doctrine of the Catechism. He might afterwards have expressed himself more guardedly, and less ambiguously: but in the *ambiguity* of the phrase he *must* have considered that there was room for the sense of those who repudiated all teaching of "real presence" *under the forms*.

PAPERS

ON THE

EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

No. VI.

THE CATECHISM.

We have to enter now on what may be called a new field of enquiry. A wide interval separates between the writings and books which have been before us hitherto, and those documents which may be strictly called the Authorized Formularies of our Church. We are passing from *works* of *some* authority to works of a far higher authoritative value. We come now to examine teaching which we find in our Prayer Book.

And desiring to proceed still upon the same plan of ascending from those of lower, step by step, to those of higher authoritative importance, I take the Catechism first, because I regard it as being, for our purpose, of somewhat lower value (in some sense) than other parts of the Prayer Book. The grounds of this opinion will be seen presently. For my plan will be to show:—

I. That as a theological exposition of doctrine, the Catechism possesses an elementary and therefore subsidiary character.

II. That it is historically impossible that the teaching of the Catechism on the Lord's Supper can have been intended or understood to teach the Real Objective Presence.

III. That the Catechism uses no language on this subject but what is the common language of Reformed Protestants.

IV. That the language of the Catechism is the proper language to express the views of those who deny the Real Objective Presence.

V. That the language of the Catechism is repugnant to the views of those who hold the Real Objective Presence.

I. In maintaining the subsidiary character of the teaching of the Catechism, I must not be misunderstood as desiring, in any way, to depreciate the value of this admirable manual of Christian instruction; nor as desiring to shrink, with any sort of suspicion or dread, from the full force and weight of all that the Catechism teaches on the subject of the Eucharist.

I am well aware, indeed, that it contains that, on which, next perhaps to the notice at the end of the First Book of Homilies, the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence have chosen most strongly to entrench themselves. That their hold on the Catechism cannot be maintained, we shall, I think, see presently. Meanwhile, because such a supreme and overriding authority has been claimed for the Catechism, and because I think it not altogether unimportant that our authoritative documents should be set in their natural and true order of relative importance, I deem it right to take up a little time in endeavouring to show what is the true position of the Catechism in relation to our other formularies.

And for this purpose I observe, that at the Savoy Con-

ference, when the Puritans desired to have added to the Catechism, "somewhat* particularly concerning the nature of faith, of repentance, the two covenants, of justification, sanctification, adoption and regeneration:" the answer of the bishops was in these words, "The Catechism† is not intended as a whole body of divinity, but as a comprehension of the articles of faith, and other doctrines most necessary to salvation; and being short, is fittest for children and common people, and as it was thought sufficient upon mature deliberation, and so it is by us."

I claim for this declaration no sort of authority, I only bring it as evidence that the sanction given to the Catechism was understood to be a sanction for it *as* a Catechism —and as such, as distinct from a whole body of Divinity— because made suitable for childish understandings, and intended to be taught to children by those capable of giving them higher instruction with advancing intelligence; in which, therefore, while we are to expect, indeed, to find Truth and nothing but Truth,‡ yet we should be unreason-

* See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 327.

† See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 358.

‡ This is no question of any attempt to deceive children by "ambiguities of expression." (See Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 237.) It is merely the question of the church's understanding something of the nature and capabilities of children, and having the parental wisdom and tenderness to deal with them accordingly. Our homily which is designed not only to instruct, but to shew the need of instruction on the subject says, "We may learn, that both more perfect knowledge is required at this time at our hands. and that the ignorant cannot with fruit and profit exercise himself in the Lord's Sacraments." But it adds, "Neither need we think that such exact knowledge is required of every man, that he be able to discuss all high points in the doctrine thereof." (Pages 397, 398.)

able to look for those higher or more advanced teachings by which that Truth might afterwards have to be guarded, and possibly restrained—in short, such theological expositions as we should naturally seek for in Articles of Religion, and which, from their relative position, must necessarily possess, though not higher authority, yet supreme interpretative power and capacity.

The whole of the Catechism, indeed, has now full ecclesiastical sanction. But the very history of the Catechism shews how entirely its character as a Catechism, that is, its rudimentary and elementary character, must be understood to take away from it the power of interpreting other formularies, and to put it into a position in which, so far as it may need exposition, it must receive interpretation from the other utterances of our Church. For, during a period of fifty years, a part of the Catechism was allowed to stand—and the very part which contains this teaching concerning the sacraments—without any proper ecclesiastical authority at all.* It was added at the Hampton Court conference.†

Hammond notes the prudence of our Church in the Catechism "in setting down for all to learn, only those few things which are *necessary* to the plainest and meanest." (View of the New Directory; Works, 1684, p. 376. See also Wheatley on Common Prayer, pp. 321, 322. Edit. Oxford. 1846.)

* See Nicholls's additional Notes to Common Prayer, pp. 67, 70, and Dr. Nicholls's Preface, pp. vii., viii. Lathbury's History of Convocation, p. 216. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. I., pp. 408, 404. Soames's Elizabethan History, pp. 549—551. Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 103, 104. Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 225—228. Robertson's "How shall we Conform?" p. 395. Edit. 1869.

† The facts of the case are simply these:—The Act of Uniformity of Queen Elizabeth gave authority to the sovereign to ordain and

And up to the time of the last review it rested, for its authority, only on the King's Proclamation. And the King's Proclamation, for its authority, rested only on the words of a statute, which statute made provision "that if there shall happen any contempt, or irreverence to be used in the Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, by the misusing of the Orders appointed in this Book (*i.e.* the Book of Common Prayer); the Queen's Majesty may by the like advice of the said Commissioners, or Metropolitan, ordain and publish *such further Ceremonies or Rites,* as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the Edifying of His Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy Mysteries and Sacraments." (Primo Eliz.)

But certainly this statute gave to the Sovereign no power to touch matters of doctrine.

Clearly, therefore, it could never have been regarded as a new and important doctrinal utterance of the Church of England. Clearly the Reformed Church of England could never have meant to say of that which she allowed to be introduced upon the king's proclamation alone,*—"This is

publish "Further Ceremonies or Rites." And the proclamation of King James, authorizing all the alterations or explanations after the Hampton Court Conference, rested only on this concession to the power of the sovereign.

It might have been somewhat of a stretch of this authority, but King James thought himself empowered by it to go so far as to add something to a Catechism for the instruction of children. And the addition was admitted. But assuredly that addition was no new voice—no fresh utterance of the Church.

* See Article xxxvii. Hooker. Edit. Keble, vol. III., pp. 356, 357, 374, 411, 412, 413, 431, 443, 444. Fulke's Answers, p. 355. Bishop Bilson's "True Difference," etc., pp. 129, 204, 217. Edit. 1585. Courayer on English Orders, pp. 191—197. Edit. Oxford, 1844.

a standard * of interpretation, by which to correct all private renderings of expressions which I have used elsewhere. In this voice you hear me sitting in judgment on my own formulæ. Listen,† for here I give you my full doctrine, completely and definitely. The voice which speaks is not to be explained by the Articles, nor even by the Communion Office, but is itself my own authoritative‡ explanation of them both."

Clearly, by allowing this part of the Catechism thus to be added at first without ecclesiastical authority,§ and then subsequently giving it her own authority, she recognized as belonging to the Catechism just that elementary and therefore subsidiary character, which naturally and necessarily may be said to belong to it *simply as* a short Catechism.

In such a light therefore we are to regard the Catechism still. This will take away nothing (and I desire to take away nothing) from its full authority. This will take away

* See "Kiss of Peace," pages 16, 17.

† See Kiss of Peace, p. 23.

‡ See Kiss of Peace, p. 52.

§ Mr. Proctor says:

"Care was taken to call the alterations by the name of *explanations*, to bring them under the clause in Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity. . . . . We must say, however, that these alterations had the sanction of Convocation, inasmuch as that body allowed this exercise of the prerogative, and ordered the amended book to be provided for the use of the parish churches." (Proctor on Common Prayer, p. 90, 91.)

It is to be observed, however, that Canon 80 speaks of the Book as "lately *explained* in some few points by *his Majesty's authority*, according to the laws, and *his highness's prerogative* in that behalf." The canon recognizes the changes only as explanations resting on the authority of the king's proclamation. (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 143. Note.)

nothing (and I should be truly sorry to take away anything) from the truth and fulness of its teaching. But it will help to correct the error, of *first* fastening on the words of the Catechism a mistaken sense—a sense (as we shall see presently) they were never meant to bear—and *then* setting them to work, by means of such mistaken sense, to deprive our other formularies of their true and natural meaning.

It is needless, I think, to dwell longer on this point. I proceed,

II. To show—that it is historically impossible that the teachings of the Catechism on the Lord's Supper can have been intended, or understood to teach the Real Objective Presence.

(1) And here, first, I am called upon to clear the ground of an assumption which stands in the way, to the effect that the Catechism must needs teach it, because this addition came from the pen of Bishop Overall.

We are concerned here with what our Church says, and our Catechism teaches, not with the opinions of any one Bishop.

What Overall's views were, seems so immaterial that I hardly like taking up time by entering on the question; but since there seems to be much misapprehension on the subject, and a prevailing suspicion (arising, I suppose, from confident statements) that he held the Real Presence in the sense of the Ritualists; it might seem like shirking a question before us to pass it by.

In allowing myself, however, to be led aside for a little while into this subject, I must be permitted to say that I do so only under protest, that the call to touch at all on this point can only arise from a prevailing notion of its having some important bearing on the controversy before us, which

notion, I am persuaded, ought to be regarded as nothing better than an entire misconception.

The evidence on which the confidence as to Overall's opinions has been made to rest, is derived (as far as I can learn) from three sources (1) from* a letter to Grotius; (2) from additional notes in Nicholl's Common Prayer; (3) from a quotation in Knox's Remains.

(1) As to the *first*, I suppose all claim to it is now given up, for it has been shown that the argument rests entirely on a mistaken translation.

(2) As to the *Second*. The notes were not written by Bishop Overall.†

* This was quoted in Archdeacon Denison's Defence, as saying, "There are certain zealots who condemn the practice of our Church in receiving the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ kneeling, or at least object to His worship and reservation." The Latin is "Morem ecclesiæ nostræ sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi de geniculis accipiendi oppugnant, aut eum saltem colere et custodire recusant;" which simply means, "They oppose our Church's custom of receiving the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ on the knees, or at least refuse to observe and keep it, (*i.e.* our Church's custom). (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 830.)

† The Title of these Notes is this, "Additional Notes on the Common Prayer. Many of which are *supposed* to have been *collected* by the Right Reverend Dr. John Overall, formerly Lord Bishop of Norwich, etc., etc." Then in the next pages is "An Explication of the Marks in the Additional Notes," in which are specified *six* marks, which are found attached to the various notes. And the "Explication" of the mark *† is given thus "Signifies MSS. Notes written in an interleaved Common Prayer Book, in the Bishop of Durham's Library, printed in the year 1619. *Supposed* to be made from the *Collections* of Bishop *Overall*, by a Friend or Chaplain of his: a copy of which MSS. is in the hands of the Reverend Dr. Hicks, some part thereof being printed by him, in his Preface to his Christian Priesthood." I quote from edition of 1712.

(3) As to the *third*. The quotation in Knox, (exactly as it stands) has never, as far as I know, been verified. But there is a MS., discovered by Dean Goode, in the British

That these notes were certainly not written by Overall, is proved by the references made to Overall by name, ("My Lord Overall.") Dean Goode considered they were certainly not Cosin's, as being of a different character from his.

The editor of vol. v. of Cosin's works in the Anglo-Catholic Library, regards them as certainly Cosin's, considering "the handwriting" of the MSS. to be "quite decisive." (Pref. p. xiii.) And acknowledging the difference in the tone from his later notes, which, indeed, is very obvious, (p. xvi.) he considers "the marked contrast" (p. xix.) to "illustrate the apparent change in Cosin's views."

If it must be admitted that the notes truly represent what once were Cosin's views, they are not without their value, as bearing witness to the fact of Cosin's having at an earlier period of his life entertained opinions, which gave way before a maturer judgment, and a more familiar acquaintance with the Romish Controversy, and with the real teaching of the Romish Church.

Possibly, taking into account the complete want of harmony with Cosin's later writings, and the acknowledged "great difference between the early and later handwriting of Bishop Cosin," some may consider the evidence of Cosin's authorship not yet so full and conclusive as to leave absolutely no room for question. (See Bishop Ollivant's Charge, 1869, pp. 128, 137.) There are however a few notes in this series which seem to me less unlike Cosin's other notes. (See *e.g.* Nicholl's additional notes, p. 46.) But, be this as it may, all that can be urged in favour of the supposition that Overall's views may be reflected in this series, rests, it appears, only on conjectural deductions from the references to Overall's name, and the fact of the writer being Overall's chaplain, and (if Cosin) a young man, at the date (1619) of the *printing* of the interleaved book. (See Keble, Eucharistic Adoration, p. 155. Edit. 1867.) It is to be observed, however, that the notes are largely made up of *collections and translations;* (see Editor's Preface to Vol. v. of Cosin's Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, p. xvii. and xv.) while their dates range (probably) from 1619 to about 1638. (See Ibid, p. xviii.) And, this being so,

Museum, containing an account of the matter which Knox refers to, *drawn up by Overall himself.*

I have examined this MS., and while I admit that it contains evidence of some peculiar views,* I believe that it could never have been written by one holding the doctrines now held by the Ritualists. Indeed, there are expressions which, it will be acknowledged, I think, must be regarded as quite decisive on this matter.†

it must be admitted, I think, that the true controversial value of these notes, as bearing on the question before us, is either *nil*, or something very small indeed.

* Chiefly, perhaps, in maintaining the words, "Hoc est corpus meum"—"locutionem esse propriam, non autem tropicam."

This, however, is maintained also by Brevint; and that, in a work ("The Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass," chap. xiii.) which will sufficiently show how distinctly opposed were Brevint's views to "the Real Objective Presence." Brevint regards the Reformers' sense of the words as "full and literal," (p. 211. Edit. Oxford, 1673) and that of the Papists as having "many unusual and strange *tropes* or *figures*," or "tortures," (pp. 212, 221.)

Moreover Overall evidently distinguishes his own "Real Presence" from the Presence, "Qualem Pontificii statuerunt," (p. 24.) The MS. is among the Harleian MSS., No. 3142.

He maintains that "Mahomedam sive Turcam, et Papam Romanum simul constituere Anti-christum est verisimile." (p. 39.)

† He says that the Fathers taught "non esse hic nudam figuram, et nuda signa, sed veram esse præsentiam et communicationem Christi, licet modus non esset corporalis, sed spiritualis et cœlestis."

He complains of those "*qui divulgarunt me in comitiis, corporalem modum presentiæ in Sacramento, et justificationem per justitiam inhærentem defendisse ac docuisse; cum hisce de rebus sæpius in scholis sententiam nostræ ecclesiæ orthodoxam constanter docuerim.* In Sacramento Eucharistiæ sive cœnæ dominicæ, Christi corpus et sanguinem totumque adeo Christum, vere quidem adesse, et vere nobis participari, vereque conjungi cum signis sacramentalibus, ut cum signis

The *Presence* he contends for is a Presence to *worthy* receivers, it depends on the operation of the Holy Spirit working *by faith* in the heart, and it is expressly distin-

non solum significativis sed etiam exhibitivis, ita ut in recto *usu sacramenti, digneque recipientibus*, dato et accepto pane, detur et accipiatur corpus Christi; dato et accepto vino, detur et accipiatur sanguis Christi, totus que adeo Christus in sacramenti communione communicetur, sed non modo corporali, crasso, terreno; per transubstantiationem aut consubstantiationem, similiave rationis humanæ commenta; sed modo mystico, cœlesti, ac spirituali, ut recte in articulis nostris præscriptum est. *Similiter justitiam qua justificamur coram Deo, esse solam Christi obedientiam, nobis pœnitentibus, et in Christum credentibus, gratis per fidem imputatam.*" (Pages 24, 25.)

It may be observed, that the quotation in Knox's Remains (vol. ii. p. 181, 182; Edit. 1844) agrees *verbatim*, and almost *literatim* [the "*cœnæ dominicæ*" in the first line is "*cœna dominica*" in Knox] with the greater part of this extract (the part *not* printed in italics), except that in Knox the words "*usu sacramenti, digneque recipientibus*" are omitted, and that, following the omission, "*recto*" is necesarily read "*recte;*" so that the words run "*ita ut in recte dato et accepto pane, detur et accipiatur corpus Christi.*"

The fact that the word *dato* (the first word after the omission) is, in the MS., the first word of a new line, added to the close correspondence of the rest of the citation, leads naturally to the conjecture that this very MS. furnished Knox with the quotation, and that, in copying, he accidentally omitted a few words. I submit to the judgment of others, that the words in Knox *sound* very much as if *there were* some omission. Should we not otherwise expect, at least, to have the word "*in*," if not the words "*in recte*," before "*dato et accepto vino*?" The sentence seems to go halting somewhere. The MS. seems to me just to supply, what the quotation in Knox appears to need, to make it read smoothly. The accidental omission, however, (if my conjecture is right) makes a most important change in the doctrinal sound of the statement.

Of Overall's words as quoted by Knox, the Bishop of Llandaff observes (Charge, 1869, p. 138):—"What words could possibly express more clearly, that the giving and receiving of the body and

guished *as to the mode*, from the Lutheran *Consubstantiation*, as well as from the Romish Transubstantiation. Indeed the language in which he sums up the doctrine he maintains is

blood of Christ requires, at least as one condition, that they should be *rightly, i.e.. faithfully received* by the communicant? It is monstrous to suppose that the *recte accepto* can include all, worthy and unworthy. If these, then, were Overall's words, they show with how little justice he can be claimed as an advocate of the notion that our Lord's body and blood can be in the hand of every receiver." Much more forcibly might the like assertion be made of Overall's words, as they appear in the MS.

Overall's conclusion is this:—

"In sacramenta Eucharistiæ corpus et sanguis Christi, totusque adeo Christus adhibetur *digne recipientibus* non per modum transubstantionis, nec per modum consubstantionis, sed *Spiritu Sancto per fidem operante*."

These last words are quoted by Dean Goode, who adds, "Could I wish for a more satisfactory statement of his doctrine?" (On Eucharist, p. 830.) The statement indeed corresponds exactly with Nowell's Catechism, "When we rightly receive the Lord's Supper, with the divine nourishment *of His body and blood* . . . . given to *us* by the *work of the Holy Ghost*, and received of us *by faith*," and with the words of the Homily, "The Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation which by the *operation of the Holy Ghost* . . . . is through *faith wrought in the souls of the faithful*."

The same teaching is found also in Beza:—"Id fit . . . . sola Spiritus sancti potentia et virtute, qui efficit ut ille ipse Jesus Christus . . . . nobis qui in terris sumus, non minus verè donetur quàm signa ipsa." (Tract. Theolog.; Geneva, 1582; vol. i., p. 28.) "Hinc consequitur, rem ipsam Sacramentorum . . . . ab eo verè percipi qui veram fidem afferat, idque non dentibus, aut ventre, aut ullo *crasso et coporali modo* . . . . sed *spirituali modo per fidem*, eoque non minus certo et efficaci quam si naturalis esset." (Ibid.) Again;—"Minime ambigimus quin, sicut ordinationis verba testantur, *verum corpus*, et *verus sanguis Domini*, id est, ipse Jesus Christus cum omnibus suis opibus, *verè et sine ullâ fraude offeratur*, non ore, *sed fide, per Spiritus sancti*

language in perfect conformity with that used by earlier English Divines, whose views are distinctly in opposition to the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence: but it is language totally at variance with that of those who now teach the

efficaciam percipiendus ad vitam æternam, idque non minus verè quam corporeis nostris sensibus offeruntur panis et vinum, quæ propterea etiam vocantur corpus et sanguis Jesu Christi, quoniam videlicit certæ sunt notæ, et tessaræ visibiles et corporeæ earum rerum quas nobis Dominus *spiritualiter offert, id est, veri corporis et sanguinis Jesu Christi.*" (Page 30.) Again:—"Quemadmodum igitur naturali modo *accipimus, edimus et bibimus* naturalia symbola, quæ postea virtute naturalis facultatis in nostram substantiam coalescunt: *ita* etiam *cœlesti et spirituali modo* Jesus Christus . . . . verè nobis communicatur, ut simus caro ex carne ejus, et ossa de ipsius ossibus." (Page 31.)

Moreover Beza quotes from Zwingle, as teaching the same doctrine:—"*Asserimus, inquit, non sic carnaliter et crasse manducari corpus Christi, ut isti perhibent, sed verum Christi corpus credimus in cœna sacramentaliter* (id est, sumpto panis symbolo) *et spiritualiter* (id est, non dentibus vel ore, neque naturali modo, sed fide et Spiritus sancti virtute) *edi a religiosa, fideli et sancta mente.* Hæc sunt ipsius Zuinglii verba." (Tract Theol., vol. i., p. 222. See pp. 228, 260, 279, vol. ii., pp. 126—144; and Hospinian, Works, vol. iv., p. 241. Genev: 1681.)

It may be interesting further to remark, the very close resemblance of Overall's words and teaching to the words and teaching of Archbishop Ussher:—"Neither are they to be accounted barely *significative*, but truly *exhibitive* also, of those heavenly things whereto they have relation . . . . So that in the use of this holy ordinance, as verily as a man receiveth the earthly creature, so verily doth he . . . . receive the body and blood of Christ." (Ussher's Works, vol. ii. p. 429. The whole passage will be found quoted below, p. 404.) To the same purpose, Willet says:—"The death of Christ . . . . is not only *represented*, but *exhibited* also . . . . His blood is not present only in *signification*, but *verily and indeed* to the *worthy receiver.*" (Synopsis Papismi, vol. v., p. 280. See also Bucer as quoted below, p. 402.)

Real Objective Presence, and most clearly I think, indicates views which are quite irreconcileable with their doctrine.

But besides this, let me observe, that in the year 1609 there was issued a new edition of Jewel's works, with a dedicatory preface addressed to James I.

This dedication, were are told, came from the pen of Overall.* But the writer of this dedication is one who would seem to put himself in the theological school of Jewel —and speaks of Jewel's writings in defence of the doctrine of the Church of England† in a way which he could hardly have done, if he had held any such doctrine as the Real Objective Presence.

On the whole, I admit, that Overall was not without some peculiarities of opinion, sufficient, perhaps, to justify the cautionary voice of Archbishop Whitgift.† He seems‡ to me,

* See Jewel's Works, "Defence of Apology," etc., P. S. Edit., p. 1306.

† Witness such words as these, "Touching many of which superstitious errors, even the chiefest of them (the same being controverted betwixt us and the Church of Rome), they are discussed in the books ensuing: and OUR DOCTRINE IS THEREIN JUSTIFIED against the papists by the certain testimonies of the fathers and constant judgment of antiquity." (In Jewel's Works, P.S. Edit., iv., p. 1309.)

Is it conceivable that any one acquainted with Jewel's writings "On the Real Presence," could have expressed himself thus, if he had held the doctrine of our opponents? (See also Martin's Reply to Bp. of Salisbury, p. 148.)

† "I have received your letters touching Mr. Overall, and I very much rely upon your judgment in that case. Nevertheless I am informed by some others that Mr. Overall is something factious and inclined to that sect, that loveth to pick quarrels to the present state and government of the Church; which I hope not to be true because of your commendation." (Whitgift's Works, P.S. Edit., 615. See Strype's Whitgift, book iv., ch. xix., p. 480-1.)

‡ I desire to speak not without some diffidence and hesitation on a matter, the evidence for which is somewhat scanty and uncertain.

as far as we have the means of judging, to stand probably on a sort of stepping-stone between the doctrine of the Reformers and the unhappy innovations of Laud's school.

Hardwick says, (Reformation, p. 263,) "Without materially receding from the principles of St. Augustine, or exposing himself to the reproach of semi-Pelagianism, he advocated doctrines virtually extruded from the Calvinistic system." In the matter of his habitual disregard of Rubric, and dislocating a prayer in the Communion Service, (see in Additional Notes to Nicholl's Common Prayer, p. 49,) he went further than any, I hope, were willing to follow him.

Overall appears to have had some share in some part of Francis Mason's writings on the Validity of Ordinations. From which some sort of presumption will arise that his views on Ordination were similar.

I will not venture to say how far the following quotations may justify the inference that Overall held the validity of foreign non-episcopal ordinations. "Out of a letter of Geo. Davenport to Mr. Sandcroft from Paris, Jan. 1655: 'I have learned of him (viz., the Dean of Peterborough, Dr. Cosin, whose chaplain I think he was) that the book wherein the ordination of the French Church is vindicated, was made by Bishop Overal, (with whom the dean then lived) and not by Mr. Mason. Mr. Mason, indeed, added something to it with the approbation of the bishop, and printed it in his own name, at the desire of the bishop.'

"In another letter, dated Aug. 6, he saith, 'I must undeceive you about the additionals to Mr. Mason, for he (the dean) saith, he said that the bishop was the chief composer of the first draught of the book de Minist. Anglican in English, which was printed by the King's printer.' Tanner." (Note in Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, under Francis Mason, Edit. Bliss. 1815, vol. ii., p. 307.)

"That book entitled 'The Defence of the Ordination of the Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, maintained by Mr. Archdeacon Mason, against the Romanists, is sufficiently known, and I have been assured it was not only the judgment of Bishop Overall, but that he had a principal hand in it. *Healing Attempt*, etc., 4to., 1689, p. 62, penes me. W. K. Kennet." (Ibid, p. 306).

But as Laud* himself never attained to the teaching of anything like the doctrine now taught as the Real Objective Presence, so, I feel strongly persuaded, that Overall also

Hallam considers the Divine right of episcopacy to be expressed in Overall's "Convocation Book." (See Constitutional History, vol. I., p. 396, note, Edit. 1867.) But Overall was not *the Author* of the "Convocation Book:" and the doctrine is there, I think, scarcely so strongly, and distinctly, and exclusively asserted as to leave no room for Bishop Hall's distinction "betwixt the being and the well-being of a Church." Bishop Andrewes says, "If our form be of Divine right, it doth not follow from thence that there is not salvation without it, or that a Church cannot stand without it." (See Opuscula, Anglo-Cath. Libr., p. 191.) Archbishop Bramhall says, "Episcopal divines do not deny those Churches to be true Churches." (Bramhall's Works; Anglo-Cath. Libr. Vol. iii., p. 518.) With such limitations the doctrine may be said to be taught in Mason's Work also. (See "Whose are the Father's?" Longmans: pp. 689, and 358.)

Certainly, if the corrected statement of Davenport be true, and if we are to understand from it that Overall's *sacramental views* were embodied in Mason's work, we could hardly desire better evidence of Overall's *not holding* anything like the Real Objective Presence, as the following extracts from the "Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ" will be acknowledged (I think) sufficiently to shew:—

"Si Sacerdotis vocabulo nihil aliud significasses, quam Ministrum Evangelicum, Cui Verbi et Sacramentorum comissa est dispensatio; hoc sensu nos omnes esse Sacerdotes palam profiteremur . . . . Qui verbum vitæ annunciant, non inconcinnè Sacerdotes dici possunt, quia spirituali gladio homines mactant, et immolant Deo." (Edit. 1625, pp. 543, 544, lib. v., cap. 1.)

"Si sacrificium missæ sit propitiatorium, erit cruentum. Nam *sine sanguinis* effusione non fit remissio. At Papistæ negant, sacrificium missaticum esse cruentum: ergo non erit propitiatorium." (Ibid, p. 553, lib. v., cap. 2.)

"Circumcisio est fœdus, Agnus est transitus, Calix est novum

* See Appendix, Note A.

was far from it, though he may have made approaches, more or less considerable, in that direction.

But what have Overall's peculiar sentiments to do with the matter before us? Granted that he may have penned

Testamentum. Quocirca Cum dicitur, Hoc est corpus meum, ipsa analogia demonstrat, hæc verba *figuratè* et *sacramentaliter* esse accipienda. Quasi dictum esset, Hoc quod in manibus habeo, id est, his panis, est corpus meum, id est, *corporis mei* SIGNUM *et* SIGILLUM." (Ibid, p. 603, lib. v., cap. 6.)

"Rex demonstrat se hoc sigillo illum in actualem castelli possessionem mittere. Eodem planè modo Dominus noster Jesus Christus, quamvis dicere potuisset, Hoc significat corpus meum, vel, Hoc est corporis mei sacramentum, maluit tamen dicere, *Hoc est corpus meum*, ut cor fidele gaudio (ut ita dicam) magis cordiali impleret, nos certificans, se dum panem donat, seipsum etiam donare, et exhibere, nosque in actualem gratiarum et beneficiorum sanguine suo nobis partorum possessionem introducere." (Ibid p. 613, lib. v., cap. 6.)

"Mensam Domini Apostolus nec Altare vocat, nec cum Altari comparat; sed comparat communionem Eucharistiæ cum communione Altaris," (Ibid, p. 624, lib. v., cap. 8.)

"Non hic (Heb. xiii., 10.) agitur de Eucharistia, sed de passione Christi extra portam." (Ibid, p. 625, lib. v., cap. 8.)

"In novo [Testamento] . . . nullum est sacrificium propriè dictum, præter unicum sacrificium crucis. Quocirca, quod ab hoc sacrificio est diversum, novi Testamenti Sacrificium esse non potest. Quicquid autem sacrifici crucis est commemoratio vel repræsentatio, illud ab hoc est diversum (nihil enim sui ipsius est commemoratio vel repræsentatio :) Quicquid igitur est sacrificii crucis commemoratio, vel repræsentatio, illud novi Testamenti sacrificium esse non potest." (Ibid, p. 627, lib. v., cap. 9.)

"Quum vestra Missificatio neque in Scripturis, neque in Patribus rectè intellectis fundetur, sed utrisque repugnet, eandem ut sacrilegam, et blasphemam, et pretississimo Christi sacrificio derogantem jure abominamur. Nam Christus solus est noster Pontifex, qui unicâ oblatione sanctuarium ingressus, et æternam redemptionem pro nobis nactus est." (Ibid, p. 631, lib. v., cap. 9.)

the addition to the Catechism, does it follow that his peculiarities are embodied in the addition?

Certainly not. There were other bishops at the conference who would certainly have taken care that there should be nothing inserted but what should be approved by themselves. The hand and the head which was employed in framing the epitome is of no more real importance than the very pen that wrote it.

The language (as we have to do with it) is the language of the Church not of any individual Doctor. And it is to be interpreted in its *natural sense* according to the usage of the time, and in harmony with the language of our other formularies.

The answer in the Catechism, which is now alleged as teaching the Real Objective Presence, is this—"The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." But this answer appears, in fact, to be almost entirely a compilation from Nowell's Catechism.* And we may rest assured there

* The following in Nowell's Smallest Catechism is *one* answer, which in our Church Catechism is broken into *two*. (See Goode on Eucharist, i., p. 188.)

"The body and blood of Christ, which in the Lord's Supper are *given* to the *faithful*, and are by them *taken*, *eaten*, and *drunken*, only in a heavenly and spiritual manner, but yet in truth: so, that is, that like as bread nourishes our bodies, so also the *body* of Christ *nourishes* our *souls* spiritually through faith; and like as the hearts of men are cheered by wine, and their strength confirmed, so our *souls* are *refreshed* and *renewed* by the *blood* of Christ through faith; in which way *the body and blood of Christ are received in the Supper.* For Christ as surely makes *those* who *trust in Him partakers of His body and blood*, as they certainly know that they have received the bread and wine with their mouth and stomach."

went forth from the Hampton Court Conference nothing in this answer which had not the sanction of the other bishops* and divines; nay, more, nothing but what met with the

Bishop Jacobson says, "The first part of this Smaller Catechism, agrees exactly with that given in the two Liturgies of King Edward VI., and the additions made by Bishop Overall, after the Hampton Court Conference, were evidently abridged from it." (Preface to Nowell's Catechism, pp. xxxv., xxxvi.) Others have supposed that Overall made use of some Latin formula, proably "an ancient 'A. B. C. with the Catechism,' of unknown authorship." (See J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, p. 242.)

The Latin of this Catechism not being given, we are unable to compare it with the addition of Overall. It may be interesting to observe, however, that the teaching of our Catechism on the Lord's Supper presents a striking contrast to that of the Catechism prefixed to Dean Colet's "Latin Accidence" for the use of "lytel babys and lytel children." In this we have the words, "By gracyous Eucharistye where is ye very presence of the persone of Christ under forme of breed, we be nouresshed spiritually in God." (See Lufton's Introduction to Dean Colet's "Treatise on the Sacraments," pp. 22, 19.)

* Wheatly says, "King James I. appointed the *bishops* to add a short and plain explanation; which was done. . . . . being *penned* by Bishop Overall, ... and *allowed by the bishops*." (On Common Prayer, p. 322. Edit. Oxford, 1846.) And let it be remembered that among the Bishops at the Hampton Court Conference were Archbishop Whitgift, who declared that this Church of England *has refused* "the Real Presence," (see above, Paper No. I, pp. 32, 33); and Bishop Bilson, who taught that "your Real Presence and ubiquity . . . are the very bowels and inwards of Eutyches' heresy." (See above, Paper III., pp. 112, 113.) Were these men such unfaithful guardians of our Church's doctrine, or such ignorant and unpracticed Divines, as to let pass unchallenged an answer in the Catechism, which was really and designedly bringing back into our camp, what had before been cast out as unclean?

hearty approval of the great body of orthodox English Protestants both Conformist and Non-conformist.

Thus the way being clear for us, we have now to enter (2) upon our historical argument.

The Conference at Hampton Court, at which this addition concerning the Sacraments was added, was held for the purpose of conciliating the Puritans. This addition itself was made to meet the views of the Puritans,* and the

* At the Conference "Dr. Reynolds complained the Catechism in the Common Prayer was too short, and the supplemental one drawn up by Nowell . . . . too long for children to get by heart. He desired, therefore, an uniform Catechism might be made for general use." (Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. vii., p. 284.) So Neal says, "The Doctor . . . . desired a new Catechism, to which the king consented." (History of Puritans, vol. i., p. 399. See also Soames's Elizabethan History, p. 538.)

At the Savoy Conference the Puritans, so far from making any objection to the teaching of the Catechism concerning the Lord's Supper, express a kind of special commendation of the addition made at the Hampton Court Conference, "as being more fully and particularly delivered than the other parts of the Catechism, in short answers fitted to the memories of children," desiring that it might be as a model for "a more distinct and full explication of the Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer." (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 327.)

Bishop Cosin says:—

"In the Conference at Hampton Court, great complaint was made by the ministers there, that this public short Catechism was defective in the point of the Sacraments; whereupon it was ordered, that the Bishops should make an addition, and so they did; which by King James his authority only, was annexed to the former Catechism, which ended after the answer following the Lord's Prayer. The addition was first penned by Bishop Overall (then Dean of Paul's), and allowed by the Bishops." (Bishop Cosin in Nicholls' Additional Notes to Common Prayer, p. 58.)

general result of the Conference was regarded as a concession to the Puritans, so far as it went.* So that the king, anxious not to seem to have gone too far in the way of yielding, was careful to make it understood that the matters conceded were not important, and were rather explanations than alterations.†

It was, indeed, at first thought, that the concessions were more important than they afterwards‡ proved, and hence

An argument has sometimes been urged in favour of the Real Objective Presence from the *amount* of teaching which the Catechism contains, on the subject of the Sacraments. But (not to mention the Assembly's Catechisms and Nowell's) might not the same argument apply equally to the Catechism of Beza? (See his Tract. Theol., vol. i., p. 693.) Nowell's Smallest Catechism (the English copy) *differs* almost *only*, in having the part on the Sacrament *more* "*full* and *copious*." (See Jacobson's Preface, pp. xxxiv., xxxvi.)

* Soames says:—"It was, therefore, very far from the fruitless mockery of just expectations which has often passed for its real character. On the contrary, every objection, really found tenable, met a suitable remedy; and a discussion that left the Church of England very much as we now find it, proved how little ground of exception could be taken to its formularies by scholarly and moderate men." (Elizabethan History, p. 552,)

† The king's proclamation sets forth that "Notwithstanding with the consent of the bishops and other learned men, some passages were rather explained than altered; yet, with reasonable construction every thing might very well have stood in its former condition."(See Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. vii., p. 301.)

‡ For the news had been given out that the Nonconformists had gained "an absolute victory;" that the king gratified Dr. Rainolds in every thing desired; that greater things were yet to be expected; that the king "treated the bishop ruggedly," but was "kind and caressing to Dr. Reinolds." (See Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. vii., p. 306. Hallam's Constitutional History, vol. i., p. 297. Edit. 1867.)

arose some considerable disappointment and discontent. No doubt, also, there were exceptions subsequently taken to some particulars contained in the part added to the Catechism. And in respect of the most important of these an alteration was made at the last Review to meet the views of the Puritans. But still, on the whole, what was done at the Hampton Court Conference, including this addition to the Catechism, was understood to be, *so far*, a yielding to the desires of the complainants.* And, as the result of this we are told of Rainolds,† and the other agents for

* L'Estrange, maintaining the authority of the changes made by King James's Proclamation, as being made "by Act of Parliament, *reductive* and *implied*," alleges against the proclamation losing its vigour by the king's death, that his late majesty "did not null it by any express edict; that several parliaments sitting after did not disallow it; that all subscriptions have been unanimous in reference to those changes; that THE EMENDATIONS WERE *made to* SATISFY THE LITIGANT PARTY." (Alliance of Divine Offices. Oxford Edit.: p. 38.)

† Of Rainolds Collier says, that:—"Notwithstanding his appearing for the Dissenters at the Hampton Court Conference, he conformed himself to the Church ceremonies." (Ecclesiastical History, vol. vii., p. 341.) Neal calls him "The oracle of his time for acquaintance with Ecclesiastical History, Councils, and Fathers." (Vol. i., p. 402.) But says, that on this occasion he "fell below himself, and lost some part of his esteem with the Puritans, being overawed by the place and company, and the arbitrary dictates of his sovereign opponent." (Page 403.) Hallam says that Rainolds "was nearly, or if not altogether, the most learned man in England. He was censured by his faction for making a weak defence; but the king's partiality and intemperance plead his apology." (Constitutional History, vol. i., p. 297. Edit. 1867.)

"He [Rainolds] was a person of 'prodigious reading and doctrine, and the very treasury of Erudition. . . . He was a living library, and a third university. . . . The memory and reading of that man

the Nonconformists that, (after hearing read "the few alterations, or rather explanations, of the Common Prayer agreed by the king and the bishops,") "they assented, seemed satisfied with the result of the Conference, and promised to regard the bishops as their spiritual fathers, and perform all duty to them."*

We are told also of another† eminent Nonconformist, who,

were near to a miracle." (Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. ii., pp. 13, 14.) "As his memory was a faithful *index*, so his reason was a solid *judex* of what he read. . . . *Incertum est utrum doctior an melior.*" (Fuller's Church History, vol. iii., p. 231.) Crakanthorp says he had in his possession a letter from Rainolds to Archbishop Bancroft "in qua se huic Anglicanæ Ecclesiæ conformem esse, libenter et ex animo, etiam conscientia sua sic eum monente ultro profitetur." (See Note in Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. ii., p. 14. Edit. Bliss.)

* See Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. vii., p. 298—9.

Dr. Montague says that "Dr. Reynolds and the rest were all exceedingly well satisfied." (See note in Perry's History of the Church of England, vol. i., p. 102.) The King's Proclamation says, "The issue was, that no well-grounded matter appeared to us or our said Council, why the state of the Church here by law established, should in any material point be altered. Nor did those that before had seemed to affect such alteration, when they heard the contrary arguments, greatly insist upon it, but seemed to be satisfied themselves, and to undertake within reasonable time to satisy all others, that were misled with opinion that there was any just cause of alteration." (See Cardwell's Doc. Annals, vol. ii., p. 61.)

"Dr. Sparks is said to have been converted by the advocates of conformity, as he shortly afterwards proved by setting forth a treatise on unity and conformity." (Perry's History of the Church of England, vol. i., p. 103. See Fuller's Church History, vol. iii., p. 192. Edit. 1837.)

† This was Dr. Burgess. He had resigned his benefice rather than sign the three articles of the 36th Canon. "The king," says Collier,

shortly after this, (I do not say in consequence of this), from an opponent, became a warm supporter of the Church of England. Was this addition then regarded as teaching a

"did him the honour of a personal conference, and here the matter in question being discussed, Burgess was gained to an entire conformity, and returned to his station. After this he signalized himself against the Dissenters, and became a champion for the government and ceremonies of the Established Church." (Ecclesiastical History, vol. vii., p. 312. See Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i., p. 430.)

Dr. Burgess published (1631) an "Answer rejoyned to Reply to Dr. Morton." This book has reference chiefly to the question of ceremonies. It makes frequent reference to the Puritan "Abridgment." But it takes no notice, I think, of any objection to the words of the Catechism.

The same may be said of the following publication:—"Reasons shewing that there is no need of such a Reformation of the public, 1. Doctrine, 2. Worship, 3. Rites and Ceremonies, 4. Church-government, 5. Discipline as is pretended, etc., by H. S., D.D., Chaplain to his Majestie in Ordinary, 1660. This book takes notice of several objections to the Common Prayer, but of none touching this answer in the Catechism.

It may be said, too, I think, of all Bishop Hall's writings against Puritan objections, (1) "The Common Apology of the Church of England," (2) "Humble Remonstrance," (3) "Defence of the Humble Remonstrance," (4) "Short Answer to the tedious Vindication of Smectymnus," (5) "For Episcopacy and the Liturgy,"—that we should not infer from them that Bishop Hall knew of any objection made to the words of the Catechism. Yet he makes special reference to the "Alterations and additions." (See Works, vol. ix., p. 646. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

Other books also, written in defence of the Prayer Book against the Puritans (with the exception of Ambrose Fisher's which will be quoted below, p. 360), so far as I have had opportunities of examining them, furnish no instance of any notice taken of any exception to the teaching of the Catechism concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

doctrine which Puritans held in abhorrence? Clearly not.* Puritans were not slow to point out what they regarded as blemishes. Can any example be found of any eminent Puritan Divine who charged the Church Catechism with teaching the doctrine of Luther?

Nonconformists I believe now, some of them at least, are not slow to condemn this answer in our Catechism. But is there any one instance† to be shown of any Nonconformist

* So among the concessions proposed by the committee of 1641, we find it suggested, "Whether the Catechism may not receive a little more enlargement." But there is no suggestion for any change in the words of this answer. (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 276.)

† The question is limited to Puritan Divines of *eminence*. Exceptional cases may doubtless be produced from obscurer quarters. It would have been strange indeed if the tendency to find blots everywhere suffered this answer to pass altogether without an accusation.

Appended to Nicholls's Common Prayer (Edit. 1712) is "An Introduction to the Liturgy of the Church of England: written by way of Preface before Archbishop Laud's Collection of Various Readings out of the several Ancient Common Prayer Books." And of this, the 8th Chapter contains, "Further Exceptions taken against the Book of Common Prayer, and Communion Book of Ordination, allowed by the Church of England. With Reasons exhibited to the Bishop of Exon, by some Ministers of his Diocess, for their Refusal of Subscription to the Book of Common Prayer; with Brief Answers thereunto, made by Mr. Tho: Hutton. Printed Anno Dom: 1606." This paper contains some curious objections, and among them are *three* exceptions taken against the Catechism.

(1) The first is the common one against the words as they then stood:—"They do perform it by their Sureties."

(2) The second is against the words, "*generally* necessary," and argues that the word "generally," importeth other and more Sacraments; in particular implying the Popish Sacraments.

The following is part of the "answer" which may be worth noting:—

"The word *as*, is as a partition wall betwixt the Sacraments and

theologian of learning and authority, uttering one word of objection to this, for many years after it was published and set forth ?

Generally, giving a reason why two Sacraments are received, and no more. There are two sacraments as *generally necessary* in a signification taken at large, meaning no more, because naming no more but two, and these two not *simply* and *absolutely* necessary, as if a Christian were damned without them ; but as GENERALLY *necessary*, that is, when they may be had according to Christ's Institution."

(3) The *third* exception is taken to the answer before us, which it says, "savours too much of Transubstantiation: and is against the 28th Article, which saith, *they are taken after a spiritual manner by the faithful.*" The "answer" to this exception is specially worthy of attention. I will give it entire:—"In this sentence it is set down a difference between *Anabaptists* and *Papists:* the one making them *bare and naked Signs ;* the other the *real and corporal Presence.* Here one clause distinguishes both dangerous opinions (*the body and blood of Christ verily and indeed*). So then not only bare and naked Signs (*are taken and received*). So then not (*are* only), as if there was a stop and breath (but *are taken and received*), to shew they are not of out of use, and out of use if not (*taken, and taken and received of the faithful*) as if NO FAITH, then *verily and indeed* NO BODY NOR BLOOD OF CHRIST: *of the faithful*, to distinguish from that FALSEHOOD which teacheth the BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST ARE VERILY AND INDEED used or not used, *be the party* FAITHFUL OR NOT FAITHFUL. *Verily and indeed*, the words they stick at, savour as much of Transubstantiation as Mr. Calvin's words, speaking of the elements, saith, 'They are not bare signs, but joined to their truth and substance ; neither must the Sacraments, by any means, be separated from their truth and substance.' "

I think it will be found that Neal, in his History of the Puritans, takes no account of the "exhibition" of these "*reasons*," and makes no mention (I think) of these "*exceptions*."

The "answer," as quoted above, may surely be taken as adding somewhat of valuable testimony to the position maintained in the text, as shewing clearly the sense in which the language of the Catechism was understood, and the grounds on which it was maintained

How are we to account for the absence of all condemnation or censure of this answer from Puritan Divines of note and esteem? How comes it, that the loud cry of complaint is hushed before these words of our Catechism, or taken up

and defended, by what may be called the High Church Theology of the period. There is obviously no room here for the "Real Objective" theory.

The same may be said of the answer to the objection put into the mouth of the Puritans in Fisher's "Defence of the Liturgy." (See below; p. 360.)

I must not, of course, be understood to deny the possibility of other exceptional examples being found of Puritan objections to the words of the answer in the Catechism.

But when all that may be found shall be put together, I do question whether they will carry sufficient weight to break the force of the argument in the text, or even materially to deduct from its value.

In the general silence of Puritans on this point, there is an acquiescence in, and assent to the soundness of the doctrine herein taught, such as must, I think, clear the answer from having, in the language of the period, anything of a really Lutheran character. Their feeling, in regard of the Hampton Court Conference, appears to have been, that in the changes made were concessions paltry and insufficient; and that they had ground of complaint in the refusal of larger and more important alterations; *not* that occasion had been taken for the added injury of introducing a doctrine which they regarded with the strongest repugnance.

Neal himself writes very sorely concerning the Hampton Court Conference, saying:—"Thus ended this mock Conference, for it deserves no better name." (Vol. i., p. 402.) He speaks of "the few alterations or explanations" as "not answering the expectations" of the Puritan divines. But he does not seem to have any word of objection to make either to this addition to the Catechism or to any other of the explanations.

"The alterations were wholly immaterial; the most important being an explanatory clause to the title Confirmation." (Annals of Evangelical Nonconformity by T. W. Davids, p. 130.)

by some few and feeble voices, which serve only to make more striking the general silence?

In the year 1606, was published a book entitled "A Survey of the Book of Common Prayer." To this book there are frequent references made in Bishop Cosin's first series of notes on the Prayer Book, which has commonly passed under the name of Overall. This is said to be "apparently one of the most systematic and authoritative collections of the objections of the Puritans."* But in this there is no exception† taken to this answer in the Catechism.

When the Dissentients at Conference at Savoy, in 1662, sent in their long paper of grievances, and going through the whole Prayer Book, laid their fingers on every word and expression in which they thought might be found a blot‡—how is it to be accounted for, that while commenting freely on the Catechism, and passing under review its several parts, the answer which contains the teaching which is alleged to be the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, is passed by without one word of objection, without one syllable of criticism, without so much as a suggestion that the words might be more cautiously expressed, without even a whisper that it might be framed more to their mind? And yet, if they had seen lurking here

* See Editor's Preface to vol. v. of Cosin's Works in the Anglo-Catholic Library, p. xviii. It came probably from the Middleburgh press. See Procter on Common Prayer, p. 115, note 1.

† See Appendix, Note B.

‡ We are told that on this occasion "the Presbyterians heaped together all the old exceptions which the Puritans for a hundred years had raised against the Liturgy, with the addition of some new ones." (Preface to Nicholls' Common Prayer, ix.)

but the trace of the doctrine of the Real or Corporal Presence, all their other objections, even the whole sum of all their matters of complaint, would have sank into insignificance beside it. Did then the Puritan Divines pay no particular regard to the Catechism? They sent in six exceptions to it. Is it possible then that they did not have under their eye the part added at the Hampton Court Conference? Three of the answers from this part are set down by them for amendment. But not one of the answers which teach the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is noticed or referred to in any way. How is this to be accounted for?

This is a fact to which I must be allowed to direct very special attention. Let it be permitted to me to say without offence to any, that it is surely a matter worthy of the very calm and serious consideration of all, who, from whatever point of view, have been in the habit of regarding this answer as having something of a "Real Objective" look—as not sounding quite like the pure language of the Reformed; that at the Savoy there was actually nothing hinted concerning any amendment, of which, in the view of the Puritans, this answer might be capable.

At a time when the Dissentients were called upon by their principles, and prompted by their feelings, and required by a great occasion, to point out all the blemishes they could, and multiply objections to the uttermost, and find fault wherever fault could be found—no objection was made to this answer, and no fault was found with the teaching of the Catechism concerning the Lord's Supper.

Here the Puritans did not ask for one word to be altered, did not desire one phrase to be amended.

This answer in the Catechism has passed their scrutiny unchallenged. It has stood the fire of their severest

criticism, and has come out without a hair singed. *The keen piercing eye of the most searching Puritan inspection has been upon it, and we have it on record, that there* WAS FOUND IN IT NOT A FLAW.

And how, I ask, is this to be accounted for?

It is utterly unaccountable, I believe, on the supposition of this answer speaking the language or containing the doctrine of those who held the Eucharistic opinions of Luther. And how, I ask, is all this to be accounted for? It can only be accounted for in one way, and that is, by the fact that this addition to the Catechism was neither intended nor understood to teach any such doctrine. And thus we are led to our third point, which is:—

III. That the Catechism uses no language on this subject but what is the language common to all the Reformed Protestants of that day.

By "that day" I mean to include a whole century, indeed more than fifty years before that date, and more than full fifty years after. I mean it to go back to take in the Reformation period of King Edward's reign, and to go forward to the date of the Conference of Savoy, and final settlement of our formularies.*

* The historical argument might be materially added to. Dean Goode has brought together valuable extracts from a *catena* of expositions of the Catechism, commencing with that of Dr. Mayer, which was published about the year 1622, the later editions of which (at least) were "published by command," with the royal arms affixed; and ending with that of Bishop Mann, published in the latter part of the last century. They may be consulted in Goode's work on the Eucharist, vol. ii., pp. 697—727. They may be said, I think, all (though not all with equal distinctness) in their teaching to exclude "The Real Objective Presence."

And of this period, I think, it may be confidently asserted, nd satisfactorily shewn, that there is nothing whatever aught in the Catechism, which may not be matched (1)

Some considerable historical weight must also be attributed to the ollowing very positive statement as to the meaning of the Church of ngland in this very answer of the Catechism, made by Bishop eremy Taylor, who, it will be observed, speaks of the doctrine aught as being the doctrine also "generally of the Protestants."

"The doctrine of the Church of England, and generally of the rotestants in this article, is, that after the minister of the holy nysteries hath ritely prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and he wine, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of hrist, after a sacramental, that is, in a spiritual, real manner; so that ll that worthily communicate do by faith receive Christ really, effectually, to all the purposes of His passion: the wicked receive not Christ, but the bare symbols only; but yet to their hurt, because the offer of Christ is rejected, and they pollute the blood of the covenant by using it as an unholy thing. The result of which doctrine is this:—it is bread, and it is Christ's body: it is bread in substance, Christ in the sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed, as the symbols are; each as they can, Christ as Christ can be given; the bread and wine as they can, and to the same real purposes to which they are designed; and Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul as the elements do the body. It is here as in the other sacrament; for as there natural water becomes the laver of regeneration, so here bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ; but there and here too the first substance is changed by grace, but remains the same in nature. That this is the doctrine of the Church of England is apparent in the Church Catechism, affirming the 'inward part or thing signified' by the consecrated bread and wine to be 'the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received of the faithful in the Lord's Supper;' and the 'benefit' of it to be—'the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine:' and the same is repeated severally in the exhortation, and in the prayer of the address before the consecration, in the canon of our communion; 'verily and indeed' is *reipsa*, that's really enough,

in the writings of our English Reformers, (2) in the Confessions of faith of other Reformed Churches, (3) in the declarations of Puritan Divines.

(1) To take first the case of our English Reformers. Mr. Sedley Taylor has made such a careful and well-chosen selection of a few brief passages from their writings, that (though very many more might be added) I cannot do better than quote from his pamphlet, what I may call the cream of his extracts, asking my readers to bear carefully in mind that the writers have all borne witness to their repudiation of the Real Objective Presence.

([1]) "Take then this lesson . . . that thou look up with faith upon the *holy body and blood* . . . . thou *receive* it . . . . and thou *take* it fully." (Homily on worthy receiving of the Sacrament, Part I.—quoting from Emissenus.)

([2]) "He (Christ) . . . feedeth . . . with His own flesh . . . and giveth . . . drink of the blood flowing out of His own side." (Cranmer* on Lord's Supper, P.S. Edit., p. 7.)

That's our sense of the 'real presence;' and Calvin affirms as much, saying, 'In the supper Christ Jesus, viz., His body and blood, is truly given under the signs of bread and wine.' And Gregory de Valentia gives this account of the doctrine of the Protestants, "that although Christ be corporally in heaven, yet is He received of the faithful communicants in this sacrament truly, both spiritually by the mouth of the mind, through a most near conjunction of Christ with the soul of the receiver by faith, and also sacramentally with the bodily mouth, etc. And which is the greatest testimony of all, we, who best know our own minds, declare it to be so." (Works, vol. vi., pp. 13, 14.)

* "The Catechism says nothing that Cranmer, who denies the Real Presence, did not say; in fact, Cranmer and the Catechism speak alike." (Dublin Review, Jan. 1869, p. 245.)

(3) "He giveth His own flesh spiritually to feed upon, and His own blood to quench their great inward thirst." (Ibid p. 34.)

(4) "As the bread is outwardly eaten indeed in the Lord's Supper, so is the very *body* of Christ inwardly eaten *indeed* of all them that come thereto in such sort as they ought to do." (Ibid p. 35.)

(5) Christ "is spiritually *eaten* . . . and yet this is '*really*,' that is to say in deed and effectually." (Ibid, p. 71.)

(6) "I believe that . . . . we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood."* (Hooper, ii., pp. 48, 49.)

"The faithful may otherwise eat Christ's body, and that

* Among our Reformers, one of the most determined and pronounced opponents of the Corporal Presence, was Bishop Hooper, who counted the Lutheran doctrine "more erroneous" than that of the Papist. (See Orig. Letters, P. S. Edit., i., p. 37, 38.) But the "*verily and indeed*" of our Catechism, are the very words of Hooper, and are applied by him to the very same "*receiving*," as in the Catechism, and to the receiving of the *very same* THING. Hooper says, "I believe and confess, . . . that always and as often as we use this bread and wine, according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, we do *verily and indeed receive* HIS BODY AND BLOOD." (Later Writings; P. S. Edit., p. 49.)

What particular is there in the answer of the Catechism which is not completely covered by these words of one by whom "the Real Objective Presence" would certainly have been classed among "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits?"

Mr. Medd says, that the opposition to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., "was led by the extremer school of Reformers, headed by the impracticable Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester." (Introduction to First Book of Edward, p. xii.)

How can it be maintained that a formulary which, on the subject of the Lord's Supper, teaches the very teaching, and speaks in the

verily and indeed, and not only in the Sacrament." (Jewel, Sermon and Harding, p. 450.)

Taking these together, Mr. Taylor excellently observes, "We find the following expressions:

take . . . receive . . . body and blood. (1)
very body . . . eaten indeed. (4)
eat . . . Christ's body . . . verily and indeed. (7)
verily and indeed receive His body and blood. (6)

very words of Hooper, can only be fairly understood in the "Real Objective" sense?

Dr. Pusey says, "'Verily and in deed;' indeed and in truth; really and truly, are 'the body and blood of Christ taken and received in the Lord's Supper by the faithful,' and so by each one of us, if we are faithful. 'If this be not the Real Presence' I heard in my youth from an old clergyman, 'I know not how it could be expressed.'" (Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 166.) No doubt it is the Real Presence, in some sense. But it must be obvious, I think, that no argument can be drawn from this language in support of "The Real Presence" which Dr. Pusey teaches, unless first, Dr. Pusey will accept and be satisfied with such a "Real Presence" as was taught by Bishop Hooper.

Language rising to the same level is found repeatedly in the writings of Jewel, who, in opposition to the doctrine of a Real Corporal Presence at least, was scarcely less thorough-going than Hooper; and who, though pronounced by Hooker to be "the worthiest divine in Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years" (Eccles., Pol., ii., chap. vi., § 4), has, in late years, been stigmatized as "an irreverent dissenter." (See Essays on the Church, p. 160.) Take as an example the following:—

"We teach the people, not that a naked sign or token, but that Christ's *body and blood indeed and verily is* GIVEN *unto us;* that we *verily eat* it; that we *verily drink* it; that we *verily* be relieved and live by it; that we are bones of His bones, and flesh of his flesh; that Christ dwelleth in us, and we in Him." (Jewel; Sermon and Harding, p. 448.)

Compare these with the paragraph of the Catechism, 'The Body and Blood of Christ are *verily and indeed taken and received* in the Lord's Supper,' and it will be seen that every single expression used in it is to be found in the passages just examined."*

(2) In the Confessions of faith of other Reformed Churches it may not be possible (as it could hardly be expected) to find such an actual identity of expressions; but it will not be difficult to find, at least a real and true identity of teaching.†

(*a*) We will turn first to the latter Confession of Helvetia 1566—written by the pastors of Zurich (Bullinger being the most prominent) "and approved and subscribed not only by the Tigurines (inhabitants of Zurich) themselves, and their confederates of Berne, Schaffhausen, Sangalia, Rhetia, Mulhausen and Bienne; but by the Churches of Geneva, of Savoy, of Poland, and likewise of Hungary, and of Scotland."‡

This is that Confession of which we have seen Grindall writing to Bullinger that we most fully agree with it.§

* See pp. 6, 8, of "The so-called Real Objective Presence in the Lord's Supper no doctrine of the Church of England, by Sedley Taylor, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge." (Macmillan & Co.)

† See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 741.

‡ See "Hall's Harmony of Protestant Confessions." (xxxix.)

§ Of this Confession also, Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, writes to Bullinger, (1574,) "That Confession of true religion which you published in 1566, is now read in English, and in the hands of every one." (Zurich Letters i., p. 304.)

This Confession was declared by the Bishop of Meux to excel "all

Nothing can well be clearer than its repudiation of anything like the Real Objective Presence and the doctrine of the Lutherans on the Lord's Supper, of which evidence may be seen above in our third Paper, p. 167, note. The following extracts are made from the English translation as given in Mr. Hall's "Harmony of Protestant Confessions."

"The Lord by this sacred rite . . . doth now *feed* us with His *flesh*, and giveth us His *blood* to drink. . . . . By this holy Supper . . . . *the faithful* . . . . *receive* . . . . the flesh and blood of the Lord, and do feed on them to life everlasting." (Pages 316-7.)

"By spiritual meat we mean not any imaginary thing, but the *very body* of our Lord Jesus, *given* to us; which . . . . is *received* of the faithful . . . . by faith." (Page 318.)

(*b*) Secondly,* we will turn to the former Confession of Helvetia.

It was "written at Basle, about the year 1536, in behalf of all the churches of Helvetia, and sent and presented to the assembly of divines at Wirtemburg," by Bucer and Capito.

The following passages are quoted, as before, from Hall's Harmony.

"We do indeed eat the body, and we do indeed drink the blood, of our Lord." (Page 322.)

"These holy gifts of God are represented unto us by

other compendiums of the same kind which he had seen in precision and plainness." (See Edgar's Variations of Popery, p. 3.)

* See Hall's Harmony, xxxviii.

visible signs, to wit, bread and wine . . . . here we must think upon greater things, to wit, not of eating bread, or drinking wine, but of *receiving* the Lord Himself, with all His gifts, by a faithful mind." (Page 322.)

"It is most evident, that in the Holy Supper we do not take away our Lord Christ from His church, nor deny *that His body and blood is there received* to be our nourishment unto life eternal." (Page 323.)

(*c*) The Confession of Basle* was first written in German, about 1532. But in 1561 it was again recognised and received by the ministers of Basle. It is sometimes called the Confession of Mulhausen. The following brief extract is to our purpose:—

"In the Supper of the Lord . . . we firmly believe . . . that our souls, by faith in Christ crucified, are fed and moistened with the flesh and blood of Christ." (Page 325.)

(*d*) The Confession of France† was first presented to Francis the Second, in 1559; again in 1561, to Charles the Ninth; and in 1566 was published in Latin, by the Pastors of the French churches, with a preface to all other evangelical pastors.

In this Confession we have under Article 36, the following statement:

"We affirm that the Holy Supper of the Lord . . . . is a witness to us of our uniting with our Lord Jesus Christ; because that He . . . . *doth indeed feed us* and nourish us *with His flesh and blood*. . . . . We believe that . . . . he doth nourish and quicken us *with the substance* of His body

* See Hall's Harmony, p. xxxviii.

† See Hall's Harmony, p. xxxix.

and blood, *apprehended by faith.*" (Hall's Harmony, p. 330.)

And again, under Article 37, "We believe . . . that God doth *indeed*, that is truly and effectually, give whatsoever he doth there sacramentally represent: and accordingly with the signs we join the true *possession* and *fruition* of *that* thing, which is there offered unto us. Therefore we affirm, that they which do bring pure faith, as it were a certain vessel, unto the Holy Supper of the Lord, do *indeed receive that* which there the signs do witness; namely, that the *body and blood of Jesus Christ* are no less *the meat and drink of the* soul, than bread and wine are the meat of the body." (Hall's Harmony, p. 331.)

(*e*) Next we take from the Confession of Scotland, composed by Knox (allowed by Parliament, 1560, ratified 1567, and subscribed by the King, 1581,)* the following passage, "As the Eternal Godhead giveth to the flesh of Christ Jesus . . . life and immortality; so doth Christ Jesus *His flesh and blood, eaten and drunken by us*, give unto us the same prerogatives." (Hall's Harmony, p. 335.)

(*f*) Lastly, we appeal to the Belgian† Confession, published

* See Hall's Harmony, p. xxxix., and Edgar's Variations of Popery, p. 3.

† At the Synod of Dort, "the English Divines," agreed to this Confession, "except the Articles relating to the parity of ministers and ecclesiastical Discipline." (See Neal's History of Puritans, vol. i., p. 466.) In this Confession it is declared that, "Although the signs be coupled with the things signified, yet both of them are not received of all. For an evil man verily receiveth the Sacrament unto

in the name of all the churches of Belgia, 1566, and confirmed in public Synod, 1579.* Here it is declared, "He testifieth, that as *truly* as we do *receive* and *hold in our hands* this sign, eating the same with our mouths . . . so *truly* we *do by faith* (which is to our soul instead of hand and mouth) *receive* the *very body* and *true blood* of Christ . . . Neither shall we err in saying, that that which is eaten is the very natural body of Christ, and that that which is drunk is the very blood of Christ. . . . Christ is *communicated* to the *faithful* ONLY." (Hall's Harmony, pp. 336, 337).

With these may be compared the following from the Irish Articles of 1615: "In the outward part of the Holy Communion, the body and blood of Christ is in a most lively manner represented, being no otherwise present with the visible elements than things signified and sealed are present with the signs and seals; that is to say, symbolically and relatively. But in the inward and spiritual part, the *same body and blood* is REALLY and SUBSTANTIALLY *presented unto all* those who have grace to receive the Son of God, even to all those that believe in His name." (See Neal's History of Puritans, vol. iii., p. 517.)

It seems needless to stay to point out the agreement of these Confessions (drawn up by those who entirely repu-

his own condemnation; but the thing or truth of the Sacrament he *receiveth not*. . . . . For Christ is communicated to *the faithful* ONLY." (See Fuller's Church History, vol. iii., p. 280. Edit. 1837.)

* See Hall's Harmony, p. xxxix.

diated the Corporal Presence,) with the answer in the Catechism.

There is nothing which can be drawn out from the teaching of the Catechism, or fairly fastened on to its expressions, which is not clearly taught in these Confessions of faith.*

They all unite in bearing witness to the truth, that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

(3) It remains to make good our assertion concerning the agreement also in this teaching of our English Puritans.†

* Other Protestant testimonies of the same character may be seen in Cosin's History of Transubstantiation, chap. ii. The following also may be added.

"We affirm that no distance of place can hinder the communion which we have with Christ's body and blood; because the Supper of the Lord is a heavenly thing, and though upon earth we receive with our mouths bread and wine, *viz.*, the true symbols of his body and blood; yet by faith, and through the operation of the Holy Spirit, our souls (of which this is the chief food) being carried up into heaven, enjoy the body and blood present. And in this respect, we say that the body does truly join itself to the bread, and the blood to the wine, but yet no otherwise than sacramentally, neither after a local or natural manner. But because they do effectually signify that *God gives them* to the faithful communicants, and that they do *by faith* TRULY AND CERTAINLY *receive* them." (Resolution of Protestants at the Colloquy of Poissy. See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative. vol. x., p. 61.)

Of the Zwinglians, at the Conference of Marpurg, it is said: "Neque negari volunt, verum corpus et sanguinem Christi adesse." (Seckend., 138. See Edgar's Variations of Popery, p. 7.)

† Is there anything in the teaching of the answer of the Catechism which is not contained in the following words of John Owen?

"Christ is REALLY *exhibited and communicated* to the souls of men who exercise faith upon Him in this ordinance,—REALLY *exhibited*,

For this purpose we cannot do better than appeal to "The humble advice of the Assembly of Divines by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, concerning a

with all the benefits of His death. . . . . That there is such an exhibition of Christ, appears,—(1.) By the sacramental relation there is between the outward elements and the thing signified. 'This is my body,' says Christ,—'this bread is so;' and, 'this is my blood.' *It is the* BODY OF CHRIST *and* THE BLOOD OF CHRIST that we are invited to *the* PARTICIPATION OF. If there was no more in this ordinance exhibited but only the outward elements, and not, by virtue of sacramental relation upon God's institution, *the body and blood of Christ,* His life, and death, and merits, exhibited unto us, we should come to the Lord's table like men in a dream, eating and drinking, and be quite empty when we have done; for this bread and wine will not satisfy our souls. (2) As it is plain, from the sign and the thing signified, that there is a *grant or a* REAL COMMUNICATION of Jesus Christ unto the souls of them that do believe; so it is evident from the nature of the exercise of faith in this ordinance. It is by *eating and drinking.* CAN YOU EAT AND DRINK, *unless something be* REALLY COMMUNICATED? *You are called to* EAT THE FLESH *and* DRINK THE BLOOD OF THE SON OF MAN; *unless* REALLY *communicated, we cannot eat it nor drink it.* We may have other apprehensions of these things, but *our faith* cannot be *exercised in* EATING AND DRINKING; *which is a* RECEIVING of *what is* REALLY *exhibited and communicated.* As *truly,* my brethren, as we do eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, which is really communicated to us; so *every true* BELIEVER doth RECEIVE *Christ,* HIS BODY AND BLOOD, *in all the benefits* of it, that are REALLY *exhibited* by God unto the soul in this ordinance: and it is a *means of communicating to* FAITH." (Works, Edit. Gould, vol. ix., p. 617.)

Again, "This bread doth not contain the body of Christ, or the flesh of Christ; the cup doth not contain the blood of Christ: but they exhibit them: both do *as* REALLY *exhibit* them to believers as they partake of the outward signs. Certainly we believe that our Lord Jesus Christ doth not invite us unto this table for the bread that perishes, for outward food: it is to feed our souls. What do we

Confession of Faith . . . presented by them . . . to both Houses of Parliament."

This contains (1) The Westminster Confession of Faith, and (2) The larger, and (3) The shorter Catechism. I quote from an edition of 1658.

"Worthy Receivers outwardly partaking of the visible

think then? doth He invite unto an *empty painted feast?* do we deal so with our friends? Here is something REALLY *exhibited* by Jesus Christ unto us *to* RECEIVE, besides the outward pledges of bread and wine. We must not think the Lord Jesus Christ deludes our souls with *empty shows and appearances.* That which is exhibited is Himself; it is 'HIS FLESH as *meat indeed*, and HIS BLOOD *as drink indeed;*' it is Himself *as broken and crucified* that He exhibits unto us. And it is the fault and sin of every one of us, if we do not receive Him." (Ibid, p. 573.)

Again he says, "The sacrifice is offered; Christ is the sacrifice,—God's passover; God makes a feast upon it, and invites His friends to sit down at His table." (p. 566.)

The following is from Flavel:

"*Christian.* If the bread and wine be not the body and blood of Christ, really and substantially, how then doth the true believer, in receiving, eating, and drinking them, *receive, eat, and drink the body and blood of Christ?*

Minister. By receiving those elements so consecrated, as signs, seals, and conveyances of Christ and His benefits to the soul; and a true Christian *hath them conveyed to him thereby*, AS REALLY *as* a writing under hand, seal, and witnesses, can convey lands, or other benefits, which are not really in the writings themselves." (Flavel's Works, Edit. 1716, vol. ii., p. 695.)

Let the two be carefully compared, and it will be found, I think, that there is no teaching in the Catechism which there is not in the teaching of Flavel, unless it can be maintained that the words, "*taken and received*," mean more than the words, "*received, eaten and drunk*," or that the words, "verily and indeed," add something material to the sense of the word "really."

elements, in this sacrament, do then also inwardly *by faith*, REALLY and INDEED* . . . *receive* and *feed upon Christ Crucified*, and all the benefits of His death: The *body and blood of Christ being* then . . . as really . . . present to the Faith of Believers in that ordinance, as elements themselves are to their outward senses." (Confession, chap. xxix. 7, pp. 99, 100.)†

"Q. *What is the Lord's Supper?*

A. The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament of the New Testament, wherein . . . . they that worthily communicate, *feed upon His body and blood*. . . ." (Larger Catechism, p. 131.)

"The body and blood of Christ . . . . are . . . . *present* to the faith of the receiver, NO LESS TRULY AND REALLY than the elements themselves are to their outward senses; so they that worthily communicate in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, do therein *feed* upon the body and blood of Christ . . . . TRULY AND REALLY, while by faith they receive and apply unto themselves Christ Crucified, and all the benefits of His death." (Larger Catechism, p. 132.)

* Important qualifying words are omitted for the purpose of bringing out more clearly the points of resemblance.

† In the Prayer Book composed by Baxter and presented to the Bishops at the Savoy Conference, the minister is directed at the close to address the communicants thus: "Dear brethren, we have been here feasted with the Son of God at His table, upon His flesh and blood," etc. (See Hall's Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, vol. iv., p. 77.) And so in the Exhortation at the commencement it is said: "The feast is prepared for you . . . . . a feast of the body and blood of Christ." (Ibid, p. 60.)

"Q. *What is the Lord's Supper?*

A. The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament, wherein, by giving and receiving Bread and Wine according to Christ's appointment, His death is shewed forth; and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by *faith*, made PARTAKERS OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD, with all His benefits to their spiritual nourishment, and growth in grace." (Shorter Catechism, pp. 35, 36.)

None, I imagine, will maintain that the Assembly of Divines taught, or meant to teach, the Real Objective Presence; yet to judge from their actual words, it seems to me, that they taught and meant to teach it neither more nor less, but, just as much as the Church of England taught or meant to teach it in the words so often, for that purpose, quoted from her Catechism.

But then shall we come to the conclusion, that all Divines, English and Foreign, Conformist and Puritan,* had con-

* I subjoin some further extracts from Puritan divines, which will be found, more or less, completely to justify and confirm the teaching of the Catechism :—

"It is the Lord's table, and what feasted and cheered the heart of God in heaven, viz., *the body and blood of Christ*, God *gives us* to feast our souls on earth, so that we do in a manner eat and drink with Him in the love banquet. Take, eat, manifests a communion. Christ is *really presented to us, and faith really takes Him* . . . . as if we did *really eat His flesh and drink His blood* presented to us in the elements . . . . *We eat that body and drink that blood*, which atoned God, and thereby have a communion with Him in His pleasure and delight." (Charnock's Works; Nicholl's Edit.; vol. iv., p. 408.)

"There is a conveyance: *Take*, eat; *Take*, drink; *Take* Christ with all His treasures." (Ibid, p. 406.)

pired together at that time, to use language unsuitable to he subject, language which we do right now to pronounce nistaken and misleading?

"What bread and wine do physically convey to the body, which is strength, comfort, nourishment, that doth the body and blood of Christ by faith convey to the soul." (Ibid., p. 409.)

"This precious blood, which was the costly price of man's redemption. . . . . is *drunk*, *received*, signified, and sealed in the supper." (Swinnock's Works, Edit. Nicholls, vol. i., p. 173.) "When thou puttest forth the hand of thy body to take the bread and wine, do thou put forth the hand of faith to *receive* the body and blood of Christ." (Ibid, p. 205.)

"He hath in a stupendous way appointed *His own body and blood* to be *received and shared* as a feast among us, succeeding that sacrifice once offered up. 1 Cor. x. 16: 'The bread we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? the cup, the communion of His blood?' (So speaks Paul, a most faithful interpreter of these mysteries)." (Goodwin's Works, Nicholl's Edit., vol. ii., p. 385.)

"Now it [the bread] may be called His body, because His blessing hath infused that virtue into it, that it doth not only represent His body, but *convey* His body and Himself unto us. . . . . When we see the minister give the bread to our hand, we must conceive that Christ *as truly* offereth Himself to our faith to be *received of us*. . . . The eating of the bread and drinking of the wine doth signify that His flesh and blood do nourish in us life eternal, as the bread and wine do nourish the life present." (H. Smith, in Works, Nicholl's Edit., vol. i., pp. 46, 47, 44.)

"Let us consider his [St. Paul's] earnest assertion. . . . . *The cup of blessing*, etc. . . . . That is to say, Have not we that truly believe in our Saviour Christ, and who do by a true faith eat the bread and drink the wine of the Sacrament: have we not, I say, our very true communion with the body and blood, though in a spiritual manner; yea, with the whole human nature; yea, and thereby even with whole Christ, both God and man?" (Robert Allen's "Doctrine of the Gospel," Edit. 1606, bk. iii., p. 56.)

I trust we may not come to any such conclusion, and therefore, I desire to show:

IV. That this language is the proper language to express the views of those who deny the Real Objective Presence.

If it be not the proper language on the subject, wherein is its impropriety?

(1) Is it that this language teaches of a participation of Christ's body and blood?

And is it a part then (I speak as in the name of the Reformed)—is it, I ask, a part of our faith to believe, that when St. Paul has taught us that the bread broken and the cup blessed is the communion of the body and blood of Christ, there is in the Lord's Supper no communion and no participation of that body and blood?

Is a part of our opinion, that whereas, our Lord Himself has taught that without participation of His flesh and blood we can have no true life in our souls—we should renounce all participation of that flesh and blood in the very sacrament consecrated by His Word, saying, "This my body, This is my blood"—and leave such participation to be, not the exclusive *claim* only, but the exclusive possession of those, whom we regard as being in error in this matter?

Is this, I ask, a part of our faith? And I am sure I may take an answer from all true sons and daughters of the Reformed Church of England—"God Forbid!"

(2) Is the impropriety then in the teaching of the *reality* and *verity* of this participation?

But our Reformers taught that* *our* participation, the

* "It is great folly to say, 'verily' and 'fleshly' are all one thing. Indeed, the spiritual eating of Christ's body by faith is *the* TRUE

participation of our souls *by faith*, is the real and true, the *only* true and real participation of Christ's body and blood. And what participation is that which we would have without its verity and reality?

And what did our Lord mean, when teaching of the necessity of that participation, He added that solemn emphasis in those words which He said before, "Verily, Verily," "Amen, Amen"? Listen again to His saying:—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." There is a terrible reality and verity in the soul's great need, in the soul's great hunger. There is a "verily" in the telling, by Him who is the Truth, of the necessity of our being partakers of His Body, given for the life of the world. And shall there be no verity, no truth and reality, no "verily and indeed" in the making good of His Word, who saith, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed"? Shall we be taught, "verily and indeed" to know our great want, the absolute necessity of our being made partakers of the crucified body and blood of Christ; and then be offended at being taught to know that the body and blood of Christ are "*verily and indeed*" taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper?* Let every Christian heart answer again—"God Forbid."

eating; and he that eateth the same *most spiritually* eateth *most truly*." (Jewel: Sermon and Harding, p. 468.)

"This spiritual receipt, which is by faith, is so effectual, etc. . . . God's Holy Word knoweth *no other* receipt of Christ's very body and natural flesh, neither in the Sacrament, nor without it." (Hutchinson's Works, p. 263.)

* "That we verily and undoubtedly receive Christ's body in the Sacrament, it neither denied nor in question . . . . The thing that

(3) Is the impropriety then in the expressing of this true participation by the words, "taken and received"? But is it not right that faith should be taught to know and exercise her true office of taking, and receiving, and feeding on the gift of God? To think that this taking and receiving, viewed in connexion with the words of the Article, "given, taken, and received," speak of a giving by the hand of the priest,* and a taking and receiving with the hand and the mouth of our body, is utterly to mistake the meaning of the words, and to fasten on them a sense which they cannot fairly bear. To know something of the language of our Reformers, is to know that such a sense they would not have dreamt of. To view this language through the teaching of the Reformation, is to see that our Reformers would never have accepted such an interpretation. The language of the Catechism is in perfect harmony with their language.† They

is inwardly received in faith and in spirit, is received *verily and indeed.*" (Jewel's Works. Sermon and Harding, p. 475.)

* It is not (of course) denied that in an inferior sense the minister *may be said to give* the *res sacramenti*, inasmuch as ministerially he delivers the signs and seals by which they are exhibited. In this sense Swinnock the Puritan says: "So doth the Church by this sacrament bestow on all her children, through Christ, that food which is needful for health and strength." (Works, Nichol's Edit., vol. i., p. 182.) "Might we not," asks the Bishop of Llandaff, "be said to give an estate by placing in the hands of another the title-deeds and conveyance of the property?" (Charge, 1869, p. 144.)

Brooks the Puritan said: "With Chrysostom, I had rather give my life to a murderer, than Christ's body to an unworthy receiver; and had rather to suffer my own blood to be poured out like water, than to tender Christ's blessed blood to any base liver." (See Appendix to Memoir in Brooks's Works, vol., i., pp. 49, 50, of Nichol's Edition.)

† The following is from Dean Goode:—

"If we take the words *body and blood* of Christ in their *proper*

spoke and taught, as the Catechism speaks and teaches, of taking and receiving. But their taking and receiving belong to the actions, and the working, not of the body, but of the soul. In their view of the Lord's Supper, not the elements only, but the whole circumstances of the ordinance bear a certain sacramental and spiritual signification. Something in the same way as in baptism, not "the outward visible sign" only, but the "form" of going down to the washing and rising again from the water,* have their spiritual counterpart, not only in the washing of the soul in Christ's blood, but also in the soul's going down to be buried with Christ and to rise again with Him—Baptism, representing to us our profession, that as Christ died and rose, so should we also, being buried with Christ by baptism into death, reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord —something in the same way, the matter stands with the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in the view of our Reformers and their

sense, then the statement that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received,' can be understood but in one way, that is, that they are so taken and received by the soul in a spiritual manner. And this is the manner in which our Church tells us, in her 28th Article, that they are received. And the divines of the sixteenth century, who held this view, were *very careful* to express themselves in the *strongest terms* as to the *reality* of this *reception*, and to point out that it was *quite as true* and *real* a reception, and *far more* so, for all *spiritual purposes*, than a reception by the mouth could be. And it is only from the too prevalent *want of knowledge of the phraseology in use at that period*, that these words of our Catechism have ever created a difficulty or suggested a doubt as to the doctrine of our Church on the subject." (Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 690.)

* See Waterland, vol. iv., p. 577, sqq.

successors. They see in it, not only the reality represented by the visible element; not only the reality for the soul in the body and blood of Christ, by which the soul is to be strengthened and refreshed, as the body by the bread and wine; and not only in the breaking of the bread, and pouring out of the wine, do they see a sacramental action, with a sacramental signification, even a showing forth of the Lord's death; but they regard the body and blood of Christ as *given* to the soul's faith, even as the bread and wine are *given* to the body;—*given* to the soul by a present Saviour, a Saviour seen by the eye of faith; even as the bread and wine are given to the body by a present minister, a minister seen by the eye of the body;* and they regard the believer's soul as doing by faith just what the body does when it takes the elements in its hand; they see in the soul the hand of faith stretched out to take, and the mouth of faith ready to receive; even as the mouth of the body receives the visible element, even so faith, the soul's mouth, receiving verily and indeed that which is signified and sealed by the bread and wine outwardly received according to Christ's institution. Yes, the soul thus receiving verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ, that the believer may feed on Him in His heart by faith with thanksgiving.

This giving, taking, and receiving is all inward and spiritual, though having their exact counterpart in actions outward and visible.†

* See Appendix, Note C.

† "As with our corporal eyes, corporal hands, and mouths, we do corporally see, feel, taste, and eat the bread, and drink the wine (being the *sign* and *Sacraments* of Christ's body;) even so with our spiritual eyes, hands, and mouths, we do spiritually see, feel, taste,

This giving, taking, and receiving pertains entirely to the soul. It is only and entirely "after a heavenly and spiritual manner." It is in every part and particular belonging to the invisible. It is a giving to the soul, and a receiving by the soul. And this none the less, because it is pictured and represented by, and not only so, but bound up by Christ's institution and blessing, with the visible taking and receiving of that visible thing, which signifies and seals the invisible gift to the soul.*

In this giving, taking and receiving, the Giver is no priest

and eat His very flesh, and drink His very blood." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 226.)

Bishop Jeremy Taylor says :—"Christians are spiritual men; faith is their mouth, and wisdom is their food, and believing is manducation, and Christ is their life." (Vol. viii., p. 24.)

So Bishop Hall says :—"My bodily eye doth not more truly see bread and wine, than the eye of my faith sees the body and blood of my dear Redeemer; . . . . my hand does not more sensibly take, nor my mouth more really eat this bread, than my soul doth spiritually receive and feed on the bread of life." (Bishop Hall: Works, vol. vii., p. 512; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

So Calvin :—"Sacram illam carnis et sanguinis sui communicationem, quæ vitam suam in nos transfundit Christus non secus ac si in ossa et medullas penetraret, in Cœna etiam testatur, et obsignat. . . . . Si verum est præberi nobis signum visibile, ad obsignandum invisibilis rei donationem : accepto corporis symbolo, non minus corpus etiam ipsum nobis dari certo confidamus." (Institutes, lib. iv., ch. xvii., § 10, Fo. 489; Edit. 1618, Geneva.)

"Summa sit, non aliter animas nostras carne et sanguine Christi pasci, quam panis et vinum corporalem vitam tuentur et sustinent. Noque enim aliter quodraret analogia signi, nisi alimentum suum animæ in Christo reperirent: quod fieri non potest nisi nobiscum Christus verè in unum coalescat, nosque reficiat carnis suæ esu et sanguinis potu." (Ibid, Fo. 489, *a*.)

* See Appendix, Note D.

that stands before any altar on earth. It is God Himself, not a mortal man, Who, in our duly receiving these holy mysteries or signs, vouchsafes to feed us with the true spiritual food of our soul. The Giver may indeed be said to be the One Eternal Priest. It is He whom faith only sees, but whom faith sees indeed, as a present, personal Saviour. And the taking is the work of no outstretched hand of the body, and the receiving is the opening of no bodily lips. No! but the taking is not less real, when the soul which is labouring, not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto eternal life, and which he knows the Son of man will give; when the soul which knows its need of a Saviour, knows its need of being made partaker of the sacrifice of His death—draws near, not merely with a bodily approach to the Lord's table, but draws near with faith to the very Lord of the table, whose voice is heard speaking those comfortable words to its great need, "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest;" and draws near to receive, with the full assurance of faith—to receive, not from the bread and wine, not from the minister,* but with bread and

* Mr. Cobb appears to me to be mistaken when he represents the Church as saying to her children, on what he would call the subjective theory, "You do verily and *indeed* receive the elements, and you do verily and *indeed* receive Christ, but there is no *correspondence* between the two receptions." (Sequel, p. 290.) On the contrary, it appears to me that the correspondence is very close and intimate.

Beza says:—"Signa . . . . , miram convenientiam et analogiam habent cum iis rebus quarum vivæ sunt imaginès, propter characterem illis ex Dei verbo impressum." (Beza: Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 27. See Jewel, Harding and Thess., p. 780; Bullinger's Decades, vol. iv., pp. 329, 330; Calvin's Institutes, lib. iv., cap. xvii., § 3 and 10; Brevint's Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, pp. 14, 15.)

wine, and with the receipt of that food* for the body from the minister's hand,† to receive from Christ Himself all that is needed to make good to the soul the full and blessed meaning of His own words:—"He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

(4) But it will be said, perhaps, that every other objection being removed, it can hardly be proper language to express the view of those who deny the corporal presence,—to say that what is received is *the body and blood of Christ.*

The objection would seem to take something of this form:—"It might be suitable language for you to say that you receive the benefits purchased by the sacrifice of Christ's body and the shedding of His blood. But in the Catechism you say *not this*, but that you receive verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ themselves."

But Hooker‡ speaks of it as universally confessed to be

* Non dubium est quin Deus, qui summè fidelis est, præter signa visibilia, *rem ipsam* quoque, id est, Jesum Christum unà cum omnibus ipsius opibus, verè et absque ullo dolo fruendum semper offerat, quâ ratione dici potest ac debet (Dei videlicet promittentis respectu) res ipsa cum signis semper verè esse conjuncta." (Beza, Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., pp. 27, 28.)

† See Appendix, Note E.

‡ "See Keble's Edit., vol. ii., p. 355. "He (Calvin) was well aware that to assert only an application of the *merit* or *virtue* of Christ's passion, in the Eucharist, came not fully up to many strong expressions of the ancient *Fathers* relating to our union with the *natural* and now glorified body; nay, it appeared to fall short of St. Paul's doctrine." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 600.)

When Chedsey argued against Cranmer, "It is not true that you

most true that "the efficacy of His body and blood is *not all* we receive in this Sacrament." And for myself I feel

say, there to be not the substance of His body, but the efficacy alone thereof," Cranmer answered, "Thus you gather upon mine answer, as though I did mean of the efficacy, and not of the substance of the body; but I mean of them both, as well of the efficacy as of the substance." (Foxe's Acts and Monuments; Edit. Seeley; vol. vi. p. 446.)

Jewel declares—"We say and believe that we receive the body and blood of Christ *truly;* and not a figure or sign; but even that body which suffered death on the cross, and that blood which was shed for the forgiveness of sins. . . . . We say there is *no other* SUBSTANTIAL *food* of our souls; and that He is divided among all the faithful; and that he is void of salvation and the grace of Christ, whosoever is not partaker of His body and blood. This we say, and may not flee from it hereafter." (Jewel, Harding, Thess., etc., p. 1110.)

"Non auferimus è Cœna alimentum vitæ, carnem, et sanguinem Christi, et Christum ipsum. Nam nisi animæ nostræ hoc pabulo fuerint pastæ, neque quam vitam habituræ sunt." (Præf. Apol. to "Consensus Orthodoxus," Zurich, 1605, under "*Non sumus Sacramentarii.*")

"Quidam nobis perperam adscribant, nos spiritualem manducationem ejusmodi docere, quâ non corpus Christi, sed tantum ejus meritum et efficacia percipiatur: quos nobis injuriam facere, libri et confessiones a nostris editæ satis docent." (Ibid, under "*Manducatio Corporis Christi duplex.*")

Calvin says:—"We must needs unfeignedly receive the body and blood of Christ in the Supper." (In Coverdale, Fruitful Lessons, p. 441.)

Again:—"In the Supper Christ giveth unto us the *very substance* of His body and blood, that we may with full right possess Him, and in possessing Him be called into the society of all His good things." (Ibid, p. 441.)

Again:—"The Lord doth in very deed give . . . and . . . we do unfeignedly receive the body and blood of Christ." (Ibid, p. 461.)

Again:—"With one voice therefore we all confess, that when we do, according to the institution of the Lord, receive the sacrament

n a manner bound to enter something like a protest against* uch a use of language as would seem to surrender THE EALITY *of the reception by faith of* THE BODY AND BLOOD OF HRIST *themselves*,† because the language which tells of that

vith faith, we are undoubtedly made partakers of the *substance* of the ody and blood of Christ." (Ibid, p. 465.)

* If any shelter be needed for such a saying, let me be allowed to shelter myself under the following weighty words of Dean Goode:—

"And while the use of such phraseology, as for instance in our Catechism, has exposed us to the charge of Romish doctrine, and tended to mislead uninformed individuals among us, who have not been taught to understand these words in their intended meaning, there has also been an important object in view in their use; and that is, that we should not allow ourselves to be robbed of a phraseology which in its spiritual sense is the *proper phraseology* to *adopt* in the matter, and appear to deny that high and sacred purpose which is to be accomplished in the Lord's Supper, for the sake of preventing that misapprehension of our meaning which arises from a carnal and earthly-minded interpretation of the words. Nay more, this is the phraseology which our blessed Lord himself has used to describe our reception of Him. And therefore in hesitating to adopt it, we should be *making our wisdom rather than His* the standard by which to be guided. 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.' Justly then does our Catechism say, that 'His body and blood are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.' And the only reason why any difficulty is experienced in the interpretation of these words is, that men are apt to run off immediately to the notion of bodily eating, and drinking, because our Lord has graciously instituted a rite in which by visible and bodily acts we are reminded of the spiritual acts expressed in His words; forgetting that all which is seen and done in that rite, *i. e.*, both the things given to and received by the body and the acts of the body, are but outward representations of *that spiritual gift* and that *spiritual act* which are, as it were, the *soul of the ordinance*." (Goode on Eucharist; Preface, pp. viii., ix.)

† See Appendix, Note F.

reality has been perverted by some to a sense we repudiate.

I know, indeed, that the objection which I am dealing with, is one which is felt sometimes as a difficulty by not a few who would desire to take their stand firmly and strongly on the side of the Reformers. They feel afraid of the language which for considerably more than a hundred years, was the language on the subject, I might almost say, of universal Protestantism; and regard it as not sufficiently guarded and accurate.

They shrink from its use because they fear its abuse.

They think the true teaching (the teaching really meant) might be more correctly expressed by such words as, "the Blessings purchased by Christ Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken and received."

But such persons, may, in all lovingkindness be asked to consider well, whether the language of the Catechism is not more scriptural. And if more scriptural, must it not, therefore, be more proper language to express *our** views, who take Scripture as our Rule of faith?

Is it not wise—is it not right that our formularies should bear witness for us, that "our Church believes" (to use the

* Archbishop Secker says that the words in the Catechism are "intended to show that our Church *as truly believes* the strongest ASSERTIONS OF SCRIPTURE concerning this sacrament, as the Church of Rome doth; only takes *more care* to understand them in THE RIGHT MEANING: which is, that though, in one sense, all communicants equally partake of what Christ calls his body and blood, that is, the outward signs of them; yet in a much more important sense, the *Faithful* ONLY, the pious and virtuous Receiver, eats his flesh and drinks his blood." (Lectures on the Catechism, vol. ii., p. 250. Edit. 1769. See Eccl. History Society's Book of Common Prayer, p. 1473, and Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 724.)

nguage of Archbishop Secker) "the strongest assertions Scripture concerning this Sacrament"?

But, further, I would venture to ask such persons as efer to speak of receiving the benefits, instead of receiv- the *thing* from which the benefits come,—Do you mean express the receiving of some portion of the benefits cut and dissociated from THE THING?* You will answer, No," for you know well that what is needed and what is fered is the full and entire possession of *all* the benefits, d that they cannot be really sundered or severed from the IE THING. Then allow me to say that you mean by the ssession of the benefits—the VERY BENEFICIAL POSSESSION THE THING: You mean by receiving the benefit—a ceiving of the ACTUAL POSSESSION† of THE THING for ALL RPOSES *for which you can possibly* NEED IT OR USE IT

* Whenever in this section I use the words "THE THING," the reader ill, I trust, understand that it is written, and is to be read, with all verence, as meaning the "Res Sacramenti," the "THING *signified*" cramentally by the bread which we break, which is the *very true ucified body* of the SON OF GOD.

† "If thou doubtest of so great wealth and felicity that is wrought thee, O man, call to thy mind that, therefore hast thou *received to* THINE OWN POSSESSION the everlasting verity, our Saviour Jesus hrist, *to confirm to thy conscience* the truth of all this matter. Thou ast received Him, if in true faith and repentance of heart thou ast received Him; if in purpose of amendment thou hast received im for an everlasting gage, or pledge of thy salvation. *Thou hast ceived* HIS BODY WHICH WAS ONCE BROKEN, and His blood which as shed for the remission of thy sin. Thou hast received His ody, to have within thee the Father, the Son, and the Holy host, for to dwell with thee, to endow thee with grace, to strengthen ee against thine enemies, and to comfort thee with their presence. hou hast received His body to endow thee with everlasting right-

OR ENJOY IT.* And that which makes it the most prope language to speak of the receiving and possessing THE THING is not only, I conceive, that it is most scriptural, but als that hereby are taught two very important truths, an hereby are excluded two pernicious mistakes. (1) Th first error thus excluded, is the error of thinking that ther may be some limitation to the benefits which the soul ma thus be partaker of. For the truth taught here seems t say "Open thy mouth wide and it shall be filled, for her is no mere giving you of any fixed and circumscribe amount of blessing, that you should be able to believe tha

eousness, to ensure thee of everlasting bliss, and life of thy soul. (Homily of the Resurection, p. 389.)

In his earlier writings Luther taught, "Cum sic dicit: Hoc es corpus meum quod pro vobis traditur: quid quæso aliud dicit, quan hoc? En ego ipse sum, que pro te trador, hunc thesaurum tibi donc omnium istorum, quæ habeo, tu quoque sis possessor, si quid tib deerit, mihi deerit; justitiam meam, beatitudinem meam, et vitan æternam tibi dono." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, Part ii in Works, vol. iv., p. 12. Geneva, 1681.)

"But what then? Do not we in the Sacrament truly partake c the body and blood of Christ? God forbid that any one should den it. There is none that understands anything of the sacrament bu must acknowledge that therein, to all worthy receivers, the body an blood of Christ is both given and likewise received by them. Thi is the sense of the Church of England, when she doth so often de clare that she owns the real presence of Christ's body and blood t all that worthily receive the sacrament." (Archbishop Sharp' Works. Edit. Oxford, 1829, vol. v., p. 282, 283.)

* "This sacrament, duly given and faithfully received, makes th thing which it represents as *really present for* OUR USE, and as reall powerful in order to our salvation, as if the Thing itself were newl done or in doing." (Brevint's Christian Sacrament and Sacrific p. 7. Edit. Oxford, 1673.)

is much and that much are yours; but here is the giving you—making over to your faith *the very crucified* BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST—that you may be able to say, 'CHRIST DIED FOR ME,' that so, *with that*, you may be able to say, 'All things are mine.'* And, therefore, any straitening or limiting the blessing you receive, can never come from any straitening or limiting of that, which, in its power to bless, you receive. It can only come from the straitening of your own soul's apprehension. Therefore, let thy soul open

* This can scarcely be expressed more forcibly than by the Puritan, Sibbes, "This bread thus broken is *given*. Here God bringeth his Son bathed in his blood. The Father seeth him in his gore blood, and saith, *Take him*. . . . Besides the offer there is a further *actual delivery of it*. *Take*, eat. They take, eat and drink. What is represented by this? It representeth a further point, that we are not only in Christ, flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, but that Christ is *actually delivered;* that we seize ['take possession'] upon him. When we see the bread and wine taken, he meaneth that hereby we by faith do *accept* of Christ, and do *lay hold* of him. Here is the foundation of our comfort, that a Christian may say of Christ, that he can be assured of nothing so much which he possesseth for his own, as he may be of him. His cloak upon his back, his house he dwells in, his lands, yea, the blood in his veins, and whatsoever he hath, is not so much his; he cannot be so assured thereof as of Christ. *Take him*. There is *delivery* and *seizement* of Christ—as by the ring of a door—we are interested into heaven, and if he be ours, with him we have all things." (Works: Nicholl's Edit., vol. iv., pp. 67, 68.)

The same truth is thus clearly expressed by Archbishop Sandys:—"In that he saith 'Take, eat: drink ye all of this,' he evidently declareth that his body and blood are by this sacrament assured to be no less ours than his. . . . He made himself all ours: ours his passions, ours his merits, ours his victory, ours his glory; and therefore he giveth himself and all his, in this sacrament wholly unto us." (Archbishop Sandys's Sermons; P. S. Edit., p. 303.)

its mouth wide, for it cannot desire, or ask for, or expect, o believe, too much."

(2) And the second error thus excluded, is the error o thinking that there can be any sundering of the *benefit* from* THE THING, that the *benefits* can come to us any otherwise than from *that* THING—that we ever can receive, or ought to believe that we receive the *benefits*, without being truly made *beneficially partakers of* THE THING—that we may believe that we are justified, without believing in Christ and His atonement—that we may believe that we have received adoption, without believing that *Christ died for us*—believe that we are partakers of *life* without believing that we are partakers of *Christ's death*, believe that we receive what Christ died *to give us* without believing that our faith does indeed beneficially receive, for this very purpose, that very flesh† which was crucified for us.

* "The truth which must be held is this: that we *do* NOT *here receive* ONLY *the benefits* that flow from Christ; but *the* VERY *body and blood of Christ*, that is, Christ himself *crucified*. For as none can be made partaker of the virtue of the bread and wine to his bodily sustenance, unless he first do receive the substance of those creatures: so neither can any participate in the benefits arising from Christ to his spiritual relief, except he first have communion with Christ himself. We must 'have the Son,' before we 'have life,' and, therefore, '*eat*' him we must. . . . . This is that 'eating of the flesh of the Son of man, and drinking of His blood,' which our Saviour insisteth so much upon, in the sixth of John." (Archbishop Ussher's Sermon before Parliament, 1620. Works; vol. ii., pp. 429, 430.)

So Calvin had said,—"Dixi Christum sua nobis bona non communicare, nisi quatenus *ipse noster* est. . . . . *Corpus Christi* vere spiritualem esse *cibum*, cujus *substantia* animæ nostræ *pascuntur*, et *vivunt*: idque non minus *vere* in sacra Cœna nobis *præstari*, quam externo symbolo figuratur." ("Secunda Defensio;" in Works, vol. viii., p. 667. Amsterdam, 1667.)

† "That which quickeneth us is the Spirit of the second Adam,

Indeed I believe that the force of the objection I am ealing with, would be altogether broken, if it were well onsidered that there is no such thing as a possibility of our

nd his FLESH that wherewith he quickeneth. . . . . Doth any man oubt but that even from the FLESH of Christ our very bodies do re- eive that life which shall make them glorious at the latter day . . ? . . . . . It is of necessity that as well our present sanctification nto newness of life, as the future restoration of our bodies should resuppose a *participation of the grace, efficacy, merit or virtue of His ody and blood*, without which foundation first laid there is no place or those other operations of the Spirit of Christ to ensue." (Hooker, Works, Edit, Keble, vol. ii., pp. 251—253.)

"Vitam spiritualem, quam nobis Christus largitur, non in eo dun- axat sitam esse confitemur, quod Spiritu suo nos vivificat, sed quod Spiritus etiam sui virtute CARNIS SUÆ *vivificæ* nos facit *participes*, ua participatione in vitam æternam pascamur." ("Confessio de Eucharistiâ," drawn up by Farel, Calvin and Viret, and signed by Bucer and Capito—quoted from Hardwick's Reformation, pp. 167, 168. Note.)

"Neque censerem recusandam quin huic nostræformulæ, Christum spiritualiter adesse in Cœnâ, similis quoque interpretatio adjungatur, ne quis nos existimet virtutem Christi ab ipsâ Christi *carne* separare, vel spirituale corpus ai affingere." (Beza: Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol., i., p. 209.)

"The divine nature indeed is the prime fountain of life to all, but, though inexhaustible in itself, yet a fountain whereof we cannot drink, save as it is derived unto us through the human nature of Christ." (Dean Jackson's Works, vol. x., p. 36; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

"We are to believe and acknowledge, that as God the Father doth neither forgive nor vouchsafe reconciliation, but for the merits and satisfaction of His only Son; so neither will He vouchsafe to convey this or any other blessing unto us, which His Son has purchased for us, but only through His Son; not only through him as our Advocate and Intercessor, but through him as our Mediator; that is, through his humanity, as the organ or conduit, or as the only bond, by which we are united and reconciled unto the Divine nature. . . . . The Spirit of life, whereby our adoption and election is sealed unto us, is

being made partakers of the *benefits* or *efficacy* of *Christ's sacrifice* without being made beneficially partakers of the *very sacrifice itself.* No possibility of receiving the *blessings purchased* by Christ's body and blood without, in some sense, receiving *verily and indeed that very* BODY AND BLOOD.*

If our souls are washed and made white, they are washed and made white *only* in the blood of the Lamb. There is

the real participation of Christ's body, which was broken, and of Christ's blood, which was shed for us." (Ibid, p. 40.)

* Bishop Patrick says that the consecrated elements "do not merely figure to us the breaking of Christ's body, and the shedding of his blood, but are a pledge of that inward and spiritual grace which they represent. What that grace is we are taught in our *Catechism;* when it tells us that it is *the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed received of the faithful in the Lord's Supper.* That is, they have a *real part and portion* given them in the *death and sufferings* of the Lord Jesus; whose body was broken and blood shed *for remission of sins.* They *truly and indeed partake* of the VIRTUE *of His bloody sacrifice;* whereby He hath obtained an eternal redemption for us. *This is the meaning,* SURE, of *partaking of His body and blood,* which are here communicated. Because this bread and wine do not become His body and blood, by ceasing to be bread and wine; but by tendering them to us as a spiritual grace. Their *efficacy,* therefore and *virtue,* by the divine favour is made ours. All the *effects* and *benefit* of His passion are imparted to us by these, which in themselves are but God's creatures of bread and wine; yet by His appointment become to us the body and blood of His Son. In short *there is* NOTHING *which the body and blood of Christ* CAN BE TO THE SPIRIT OF MEN, but by these tokens He exhibits it to us, and gives us an INTEREST *in it.* THIS IS SPIRITUALLY TO EAT HIS FLESH, AND DRINK HIS BLOOD, *as both our Church and the ancient speak.* Our souls entertain and feast themselves upon His sacrifice; being really made partakers of whatsoever his body and blood can do for them." (Christian Sacrifice; Part ii., sec. vi., pp. 53, 54: Edit. 1690.)

no separating the washing from the blood. And in like manner, if our souls are fed, and nourished, and refreshed, by receiving the justification and adoption which come of Christ's atoning death, they must be nourished, and refreshed, and strengthened, by feeding on Christ's *crucified* BODY AND BLOOD. There is no separating the feeding from the sacrifice; no separating the receiving from the body and blood of Christ. Christ and Christ's atoning sacrifice, and Christ's salvation can never be sundered, so that one should be received without the other. Christ's Sacraments may by unbelief, be sundered from all these. Christ's Sacraments may be received without any one of these. But not one of these can be received alone. He that would be *partaker* of the *everlasting life* which Christ gives, must be *partaker* of the *flesh and blood* which CHRIST *gave* and still gives. He that would be partaker of that *flesh and blood*, to feed his soul withal, can be partaker thereof only by coming to HIM, who says, "He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.

Our redemption and its blessed fruits; the ransom price and the liberty of the ransomed souls: these things should ever be viewed in their inseparable connexion. CHRIST'S WORK and CHRIST'S GRACE *can never be sundered in fact, and should never be sundered in faith.* THEY CAN NEVER BE SUNDERED IN FACT, *i. e.*, as effect can have no existence except as derived from its sole cause. "We have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins," but we have it and can have it only "through His blood." But for that death and blood-shedding we could not have it. Apart from, *i. e.*, except as coming from, that death and blood-shedding, still we cannot have it. THEY SHOULD NEVER BE SUNDERED IN FAITH, for faith is taught by God's Spirit, who testifies of

Christ, and taking of the things of Christ reveals to us Christ's peace; but reveals it only as "made by the *blood* of His cross." And thus faith learns how condemned sinners can only be "reconciled to God by the *death* of His Son."

If I would be justified, I must be justified by faith, and that faith should not only believe *justification*, but believe in HIM, who *died* for my sins and rose again for my *justification*.

If I would *live*, I must live by the faith of the Son of God. If I would live by the faith of the Son of God, it must be by the faith of Him "who loved me and gave Himself for me." And for my faith to believe that He LOVED ME AND GAVE HIMSELF FOR ME, *is* just, *in other words*, to believe that HIS SACRIFICED BODY AND BLOOD are MINE; that I am in *beneficial possession* of them;* that they were given for me. And for this faith and this possession, my soul must receive the gift from Him who says, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink."† This—the *believing indeed that* CHRIST *died and shed His precious blood* FOR ME; this—the very *making Him and His sacrifice my own*, by simply taking them from

* See Appendix, Note G.

† This use of the true doctrine of the Eucharist is very clearly and beautifully expressed in the Homily:—

"Now it followeth to have with this knowledge a sure and constant faith, not only that the death of Christ is available for the redemption of all the world, for the remission of sins, and reconciliation with God the Father, but also that He hath made upon His cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee, a perfect cleansing of thy sins, so that thou acknowledgest no other saviour, redeemer, mediator advocate, intercessor, but Christ only; and that thou mayest say with the apostle, that he loved thee, and gave Himself for thee. For this is to stick fast to Christ's promise made in His institution, to make Christ thine own, and to apply His merits unto thyself." (Page 399.)

Himself the Giver—this is the *taking*, and *receiving*, and *feeding on* the VERY BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST.*

And our faith is to be taught this; in other words, our faith is to be taught, not only to receive the forgiveness of sins; not only to embrace and hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life; but our faith is to be taught, that if this remission is to be ours, if this life is to be ours; CHRIST *must be* OURS; CHRIST'S SACRIFICE *must be* OURS; CHRIST'S DEATH *must be* OURS. The* believer is to be taught to say, "If Christ had not died for me, I must have perished; if Christ did not die for me, I can never have pardon and peace. If I would have pardon and peace, I must know that Christ died for me; I must know that His death and His atonement are mine and for me; I must know that HIS CRUCIFIED BODY AND BLOOD are MINE *and* FOR ME; I must have that CRUCIFIED BODY AND BLOOD *made* MINE, that I may know it was FOR ME; *they must be* TRULY GIVEN to me, and I must *receive them*, that I may know that they are MINE; know that they are FOR ME. And when I see how

* See Appendix, Note H.

† "Sane non video quomodo in cruce Christi, redemptionem ac justitiam, in ejus morte vitam habere se quis confidat, nisi verâ Christi ipsius communione in primis fretus. Non enim ad nos bona illa pervenirent, nisi se prius nostrum Christus faceret. Dico igitur, in cœnæ mysterio per symbola panis et vini, Christum vere nobis exhiberi, adeóque corpus et sanguinem ejus, in quibus omnem obedientiam pro comparandâ nobis justitiâ adimplevit; quo scilicet primùm in unum corpus cum ipso coalescamus: deinde participes substantiæ ejus facti, in bonorum omnium communicatione virtutem quoque sentiamus." (Calvin: Instit. lib., iv., cap. xvii., 11.)

So Sibbes the Puritan writes—"We cannot have the benefits of Christ unless we have Christ Himself; and therefore, in the Lord's Supper, Christ saith not, 'This is justification,' or sanctification, but 'This is my body,'" etc. (Works, Nicholl's Edit., vol. iv., p. 68.)

Christ has appointed these seals of all that I require, saying, 'This is my body,' 'this is my blood,' I see how He has herein met the need of my soul; and in faith receiving these, I know that I receive from Him the very gift they seal and signify to my soul. *Now I know that* CHRIST'S* DEATH AND ATONEMENT ARE MINE. I take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died *for me*, and so I feed† on Him in my heart by faith with thanksgiving."

And this truth of the inseparable connection of the gift of our justification with the atonement of Christ; of our life with His death; and of the being made partakers of

* "It hath been observed above, that eating of *idol-meats*, knowingly, was *ipso facto* communicating with idolators, and that communicating with idolators, was, *ipso facto*, partaking of devils, and that the eating of the Jewish sacrifices was *ipso facto* partaking of the altar; therefore also receiving the Holy Commuion, fit dispositions always supposed, is *ipso facto* (in that very act, and at that *present* time, *by that act*,) partaking of the *death* of Christ, with the *fruits* or *privileges* of it." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 623. See Bishop Parry's True Passover, pp. 34—36.)

† "Spiritual feeding, in this case, directly and primarily means no more than the eating and drinking our Lord's body *broken*, and blood *shed;* that is, partaking of the *atonement* made by his death and sufferings: this is the prime thing, the ground and basis of all the rest . . . . The foundation of all our spiritual privileges is, our having a part in that *reconcilement*, which, in strictness, is *eating* and *drinking* His flesh and blood in St. John's phrase, and *eating* of the *altar* in St. Paul's." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 541.)

"The spiritual eating of His flesh, and drinking of his blood, by faith, *digesting His* DEATH in our minds, as our only PRICE, RANSOM, and REDEMPTION from eternal damnation, is the cause wherefore Christ said, that if we eat not His flesh, and drink not His blood we have no life in us." (Cranmer, as quoted by Waterland, vol. iv., p. 566.)

life, only by being made partakers of His death ; and of the receiving of the strengthening and refreshing of our souls *only by receiving the* BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST ;—as it is taught plainly in our Lord's own words : "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you" ; so is it also (as I think) taught in the words of our Catechism :* "The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

And let it not be said, "Then for this giving and receiving you must needs make Christ's body and blood to be really *there* in *the elements*."

No. Here is no† making the sacrifice of Christ to be

* Dr. Waterland says, "All that are saved owe their salvation to to the salutary passion of Christ, and their *partaking* thereof (which is feeding upon His *flesh* and *blood*) is their life." (Vol. iv., p. 537.)

"The *doctrine* of Christ, lodged in the *soul*, is what gives the soul its proper temperature and fitness to receive the heavenly food ; but *the heavenly food* is CHRIST HIMSELF, AS ONCE CRUCIFIED, who has since been glorified." (Waterland, vol iv., p. 539.)

† "The eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood is not taken in common signification, with mouth and teeth to eat and chaw a thing, being *present*, but by a lively faith in heart and mind to chaw and digest a thing, being *absent*, either ascended hence into heaven, or else not yet born upon earth." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 111.)

"If any do further enquire, how it is possible that any such union should be, seeing the body of Christ is in heaven, and we are upon earth ; I answer, that if the manner of this conjunction were carnal and corporal, it would be indeed necessary that the things conjoined should be admitted to be in the same place : but it being altogether spiritual and supernatural, no local presence, no physical nor mathematical continuity or contiguity is any way requisite thereunto." Archbishop Ussher, Works, vol. ii., p. 431.)

present on the *altar*. But rather; here, in and through the memorial exhibition of that sacrifice, the faith of the believer is taken to be present as on the very day of the crucifixion, at that One* Sacrifice once offered on the Cross, to know that Saviour, that Sacrifice, that atoning death, that blood shedding, all its own—and to have it so made over to it, in receiving Christ's own seals of conveyance that it may say, "All this is mine and for me." Can you not really give a large possession locally absent by saying to another of that absent possession, "I have had it fenced off and prepared and tilled on purpose for you; I give it you;—It shall be yours this minute if you will accept it;—Here is the plan representing the estate;—Here is my deed of conveyance;—Here are its seals, and signatures"? And can not the other that minute take and receive the possession by saying, "I accept it most thankfully," and taking at once into his hand the seals and effectual tokens of deliverance?†

* See Appendix, Note I.

† "Represent to your mind Jacob dividing among his children every parcel of his estate, and withal surrendering the titles that belong to each division,—'Take thou this, Joseph;—this is the field which my grandfather Abraham bought of Hephron.' . . . . . It is most certain that the surrendering such instruments (although in themselves but papers or parchments) is in very deed nothing less than giving away the very lands. . . . . Here then, Christ our blessed Saviour being desirous before His death, as by a deed of His last will, to settle upon His true disciples such a measure of His grace . . . . He delivers into their hands, by way of instrument and conveyance, the blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood (the true root and stem of all blessings), in the same manner, as to His intention, but in a surer way, as to the event and effect, as kings used to bestow dignities by the bestowing of a *staff* or *sword*, and fathers pass as much as they please of their estates on their children, by

Such a similitude of course fails to represent the full truth of the giving, and taking, and receiving, which we have before us.

Every such picture must of course,* fall short of expressing what needs to be expressed, and representing what it should represent.

It fails entirely to express how the receipt of that *absent* gift becomes immediately the *present* food for the soul's hunger, and the very cup of salvation for the soul's thirst.

It fails, too, to represent how in this *taking and receiving*

giving them some few writings. . . . . Christ and His estate, His happiness and glory, His eternity and His Heaven, are not things that may be moved more easily than the mountains or the earth: and therefore not to be disposed of in *any other real manner* than great immoveable estates are. . . . . The body and blood of Jesus Christ is *in full value*, and Heaven with all its fulness is in *sure title* instated on true Christians by those small portions which they receive at the blessed Communion." (Brevint's Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, pp. 62, 63, 64; Edit. Oxford, 1673.)

"A Sacrament is an annexe unto doctrine, even as a seal is set unto a pardon." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, p. 174; Edit. 1629.)

* "Hespusius. Imò subdola est vestra confessio. Intelligitis enim substantiam corporis nobis daré, quum per fidem Christus totus noster sit: ut si cui ager procul remotus detur, huic verè dicetur, Agri substantia tibi datur: quod de jure intelligitur. Theophilus. Utimur quidem similitudinibus ejusmodi, ut declaremus ad veram ipsius Christi communicationem minime requiri ipsam præsentiam in pane, sive impanationem corporis quam tu somnias. Sed magna fit nobis injuria quum ista non aliter detorques, quam si diceremus hâc similitudine prorsus explicari mysterium nostræ cum Christo conjunctionis, quam tamen toties testati sumus a nobis comprehendi non posse, quamvis spirituale esse, et fide fieri, ex Dei verbo agnoscamus." (Beza: Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 279.)

we are verily and indeed made to be one with Christ and Christ with us.

How can any earthly similitude picture aright the heavenly and spiritual reality?

Still such an illustration may help to remove the difficulties which some now feel in this matter, and to justify to all the propriety of that language which speaks of giving, taking, and receiving of Christ's body, though that body be not present in the elements; the "giving, taking, and receiving" telling of a such very real beneficial possession of that which is locally absent, that it fully suffices for all the soul's deep necessities;* suffices for it so to receive the gift of that body crucified, and that blood shed for it, that it may feed on it with the soul's true feeding, and be strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ as the body is by the bread and wine.

Faith wants the VERY REALITY *of the* CRUCIFIED BODY OF

* The eating and drinking, which our Saviour speaketh of, must be answerable to the hungering and thirsting . . . . But . . . the hunger . . . . is not corporal, but spiritual: Why then should any man dream here of a corporal eating?" (Archbishop Ussher's Works, vol. ii., pp. 430, 431.)

"The Church of England knows no bodily presence in the Sacrament, nor any change of the bread and wine into the natural body and blood of Christ; and all that we are required or have reason to believe concerning this matter is, that the bread and wine after consecration are, by the Divine power and efficacy, made the body and blood of Christ to all *spiritual intents and purposes;* and that he who, with the outward acts of taking and receiving feeds on Him in his heart by faith, does verily and indeed partake of all those graces and blessings which Christ merited for mankind by His death, and which this Sacrament was designed to convey to the true believer." (Rev. Joseph Harrison, 1718; quoted in Goode on Eucharist, vol. ii., p. 722.)

CHRIST *to feed upon.* It is a mistake to think that because the giving, taking, and receiving are all only after a spiritual and heavenly manner, that therefore the thing given to faith, and the thing received by faith, cannot be that *very* THING of which Christ says, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."*

The faith that thirsts is to be taught to go to drink of the water of life from the very fountain head, from the very smitten Rock.

Our soul's true hunger is to be taught to feed on that flesh which is meat indeed, by believing that in that flesh, HE was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities. It is flesh, even the very flesh and blood of the Son of God, which has redeemed the world.

He took that very flesh and blood on purpose that He might give them for the life of the world. And there is now no life for the world, no life for our souls, but by being partakers of that Redeeming Gift. To be partakers of the life we must be partakers of the Redemption, and to be partakers of the Great Redemption is to be beneficially partakers of the very redeeming price; or in other words, to take and receive the Redemption of Christ which He has wrought out and purchased by His crucified body and blood, is verily and indeed to take and receive the sacrificed body and blood of Christ. It is to take and receive them verily and indeed for Redemption purposes,† that is, for the very purposes for which they were given.

* See Appendix, Note K.

† "This is the spiritual (and yet no less true and undoubted than if it were corporal) eating of Christ's flesh, not indeed simply as it is flesh, without any other respect, (FOR SO IT IS NOT GIVEN, *neither*

And thus to take and receive them for redemption purposes, that is, to believe in that flesh and blood as given and shed for our soul's peace, is to satisfy the soul's true hunger, by feeding on the soul's true meat.

This is, indeed, to eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood. This is to dwell in Christ and Christ in us. And thus it is that our souls are strengthened and

would it profit us,) but AS *it is* CRUCIFIED, and GIVEN *for the* REDEMPTION *of the world*." (Cosin's History of Transubstantiation. Ch. i., sect. 6, Works, vol. iv., p. 156.)

"The food that Christ said He would give is His flesh, which He would *give for the life of the world*, viz.: to be crucified and killed; . . . . and so giving it, it became meat. The receiving this gift was a receiving of life, for it was given *for the life of the world*. The manner of receiving it is by faith, and hearing the word of God, submitting our understanding." (Bishop Jeremy Taylor's "Real Presence." Sect. iii., 17, Works, vol. vi., pp. 36, 37.)

"Our eating and drinking must not only feed upon Christ's body and blood, but upon them, as the one was *broken* and the other was *shed*, as they were *a propitiatory sacrifice*. And then . . . . we must draw out of them, and digest in our souls the two comfortable *ends* of the sacrament; that is, first, our assurance that we are in the new covenant; secondly, that our sins are pardoned." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, p. 173; Edit. 1629.)

"Their [the ancients'] meaning is, that neither of these elements . . . . can directly cleanse us from our sins by any virtue communicated unto them or inherent in them, but only as they are pledges or assurances of Christ's peculiar presence in them, and of our true investiture in Christ by them. . . . . If we then receive remission of sins, or purification from our sins, in the sacrament of the Eucharist, (as we always do when we receive it worthily,) we receive it not immediately by the sole serious remembrance of His death, but by *the present efficacy or operation of His body which was given for us, and of His blood which was shed for us*." (Dean Jackson's Works, vol. ix., pp. 595, 596; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

refreshed by the body and blood of Christ as our bodies are by the bread and wine.

It may be said, perhaps, that, after all, the difference may be reduced to very little more than a question of words.* True; but, for a question of words, it is one of no small importance, for it involves just THIS question, whether our doctrine does indeed fulfil the requirements of the language of Scripture, and of the declarations of our blessed Saviour.

If it does not so, then let us condemn the language of our Catechism as unsuitable to our doctrine, because our doctrine falls short of what the Scripture plainly teaches.

But if, on the contrary, we are persuaded that our doctrine does truly answer to the words of Christ's teaching, then let us not fear to express it in language, which shall come up to the level of HIS language.

To shrink from such words, because Papists might use them, and Lutherans might lay claim to them, is too much like conceding, that to teach the doctrine of Papists and Lutherans concerning the Real Presence, is the only way to teach men's hearts to speak as Christ spake, and use such language as He used.

It is right indeed, that, as occasion requires, we should guard such language by teaching, as our Church teaches, very plainly that, "the giving and receiving," is "ONLY after a heavenly and spiritual manner," and that it is by faith, and faith *only*, that there can be any receiving or eating at all. But this ought not to be allowed to detract from the truth that spiritual taking and receiving, is taking and receiving *verily* and *indeed*, and that this eating by faith is the *true* and the ONLY *true* eating of that *very* body which

* See Appendix, Note L.

was crucified, and that *very* blood which was shed for the life of the world.

It would be out of place to enter more fully and exactly into this subject here. I am only concerned at present, with showing (as I trust I have sufficiently done) that the language of the Catechism is the proper language to express the views of those who deny the Corporal Presence.

V. It only remains for me now to make good the assertion that the language of the Catechism is repugnant to the views of those who hold the "Real Objective Presence."

It would indeed be quite sufficient for our purpose to show that there is nothing here but what belongs to our own teaching—for it would be unreasonable to expect in a Catechism for children, that every answer should be so full and definite as to exclude every error. But yet we may be thankful that in the answer before us there is that which must exclude the error we are now concerned with.

The language of the Catechism, cannot indeed, possibly be reconciled with the views of our opponents, without forcing on the word "faithful" a sense which cannot be allowed.

For unless the word "faithful" be here introduced with no meaning and for no purpose,* unless it be mere verbiage

* With reference to another point Mr. Keble justly speaks of "tautology, little to be expected in such a document." (On Eucharistical Adoration. Edit., 1867, p. 81.)

To assert that the word "faithful" is "*always redundant*" (Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 260), fails to account for, or to justify, such redundancy in a short Catechism.

We are told that King James, conceding the request for an addition to the Catechism, added the following wise and judicious conditions to be observed, "Yet so that the Catechism be made in the FEWEST

in a formula, which in its nature requires brevity, and excludes needless expressions, it must be intended to exclude from participation, those who are not included in its meaning.

Therefore, since the Ritualists believe that the body and blood of Christ are received by wicked persons, void of a lively faith, a laboured effort is made to make the word "faithful" here mean "all baptized members of the Church."

It is confessed on all sides, that by "the faithful" is many times meant the whole body of the professing christians, and that thus there are two senses of the word "faithful;" *one*, in which it means "all who call themselves christians;" *the other*, in which it signifies "those who have a true and living faith."

The first is called the strict theological sense; the other the loose and incorrect sense.

By an inversion, I would take the liberty rather to call *that*, the true, correct, theological sense, in which the word stands for those who live by faith; and *that*, the loose and allowable sense, in which it signifies all who profess the name of Christ in His Church.

But name these two senses as we may, *this* we must maintain, that here in the Catechism it has what I call its strict and correct sense—the sense of truly* believing Chris-

and plainest terms. . . . . And herein I would have two rules observed: first, that *curious* and *deep* questions be avoided in the FUNDAMENTAL INSTRUCTION of a people; secondly, that there should not be so general a departure from the Papists, that *every thing* should be accounted an *error* wherein we *agree with them*." See Southey's Book of the Church, p. 401, and Cardwell's Conferences, p. 187.)

* See Malan's "Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." (Pages 136—145.)

tians. Are we to interpret this word as it stands here, without any reference to the analogy of the other Sacrament, of which the Catechism has just taught us that for its reception is required "faith,* whereby we *stedfastly believe* the promises of God made to us in that Sacrament?"

Are we to interpret it without any relation to the answer which comes immediately after, and teaches concerning the same Sacrament, that it is required of those who come to it to examine themselves whether they have a *lively faith* in God's mercy through Christ?†

Are we altogether forbidden in our interpretation of these words to take into view previous catechetical formulæ of the

* In Fisher's "Defence of the Liturgy," (1630), Novatus is made to say:—"Another thing in the receiving we dislike, that you say Christ's body and blood is verily and indeed received of the faithful." (Page 172.)

To this Irenæus is made to answer:—

"These words (verily and indeed) refute the common error, making Sacraments bare signs. But these (of the faithful) repel the Lutheran and Papist, who make the reprobate, as well as the elect, partakers of Christ."

And these words of Irenæus are written down as a note on the words in the Catechism, in the MSS. notes of some Anglo-Catholic Divine, in the interleaved Prayer Book, among the Harleian MSS. No. 7311.

† Dean Addison writes,—"The necessity of faith is expressly taught you by your first Catechism; where it saith, *That a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ* is required of every communicant: And that *the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.* For it is by faith that you there look upon Him whom God hath set forth to be the Propitiation for your sins." (Christian's Manual, pp. 107, 108; Edit 1719.)

Church, the Greater and the Lesser Catechisms of Nowell,* the use of which enjoined in Canon 79; and of which, the latter seems to have supplied the basis of the answer before us, in a somewhat longer answer, wherein the word "*faithful*" is used as the beginning, and is explained by "*those who trust in Him*," towards the end.†

Is the expression in *this* formulary (intended primarily for the use of young children) to be interpreted without any reference to the words of our Communion Service (intended for communicants) "if with a true penitent heart and *lively* faith we receive that holy sacrament . . . *then* we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood"? Or is it unallowable, in its interpretation, to refer to our Articles

* In Nowell's Larger Catechism it is asked, "Are then the *faithful only* fed with Christ's body and blood?" The answer is, "They only. For to whom He communicateth His body to them, as I said, He communicateth also everlasting life." (P. S. Edit., p. 215, 216.)

Mr. Grueber indeed founds an argument on the difference between the expression here and that of our Church Catechism. His words are "Contrast also with the use of Fideles the term 'Soli fideles,' in Noel's Catechism, and the argument from the omission of 'Soli' is irresistible." (Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1856, p. 12.) But by the same argument the Church Catechism may be said to *deny* everything, which, by way of explanation or more advanced teaching, the larger Catechism adds. Moreover, in the larger Catechism of Nowell the word "Soli" does not occur in what may be called the *corresponding* answer, where the words are "ita nunc quoque *fidelibus* in sacra ejus cœna utrumque exhiberi." But a separate explanatory question and answer are brought in to stamp clearly the limited sense of the word thus used. "M: An ergo soli fideles corpore et sanguine Christi pascuntur? A: Soli omnino: cum quibus enim corpus suum, cum iisdem et vitam æternam, ut dixi, communicat." (Jacobson's Edit., pp. 174, 175.)

† See above, p. 302.

(intended for Divines), one of which, teaching with theological accuracy the very same doctrine as that of the answer before us, declares that "to such as *rightly, worthily and* WITH FAITH, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ"; and to make the matter still more clear, teaches also that "the *mean* whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *Faith*";* and another of which (as if further to remove all possibility of question) pronounces that "the wicked, and such as be *void* of a *lively faith*" in the use of the sacrament, are *in no wise* "partakers of Christ"?

Surely if the language of our Catechism fairly admitted of a question, it were but right and reasonable to look to our Articles for a resolution of the question.

But of these Articles we shall have to treat in a future Paper. It must suffice now to say, that the universal language of English reformed theology on this subject, altogether excludes (as I believe) any other than the strict meaning of the word "faithful" here. For however admissible another sense might be for the same word standing in

* "As if *no faith*, then verily and indeed no body nor blood of Christ." (Hutton's Answer, quoted above, p. 310.)

A Roman Catholic writer says,—"The Articles and the Catechism are perfectly consistent one with another, and there is no necessity for any explanation. The whole statement of the Articles is as follows:—'The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.' Nothing can be plainer. The 'faithful' of the Catechism, according to the phraseology of the Article, are those who have 'faith;' for as faith is the means whereby the reception takes place, it is obvious that without faith there is no reception." ("Dublin Review," Jan. 1869, p. 246.)

another place and another relation, where it might naturally admit of such a looser interpretation, the subject to which it is applied necessarily fixes its meaning in this answer.

We know well, how in common things the same word has a sense fixed on it, by the relation in which it stands. We speak of "a *fine* day," "a *fine* prospect," and "a *fine* piece of silk." In each saying we use the same word, depending in each case on its having a separate meaning stamped on it by the subject on which we speak; and we do not think it necessary in either case to explain what sense the word bears in the one saying or the other. The relation in which it stands here is enough. So with the word "faithful." The relation in which it stands here is enough. As applied to *Eucharistic reception* it needs no explaining.* It *constantly means the same.*

This fixed sense of the word "*faithful*" (in this connexion) arose, no doubt, from what may be called the necessities of the Eucharistic controversy; which entered much into the office of *faith*, and led naturally to the drawing of a clear

* This assertion is confined to English Theology; but, if I mistake not, it will be found to apply to the writings of Continental Reformers also. The reader will not fail to observe how the Confessions of Foreign Reformed Churches constantly use the word "faithful" to signify those who receive the "Res sacramenti;" while the Lutheran confessions, on the contrary, intending to teach the reception of the "Res sacramenti" by *all*, do not use the word "fideles," but "vescentes." See Augustan Confess. of 1531, x., "De cœnâ Domini docent, quod corpus and sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur vescentibus in cœna Domini." (Sylloge Confessionum, p. 126.) And the Augustan Confess. of 1650, x., "De cœna Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in cœna Domini." (Sylloge Confessionum, p. 172.)

line of distinction between those who had and those who had not "a lively *faith* in God's mercy through Christ." From this arose the constant use of such expressions as "worthy receivers." And from this it was almost the necessary result, that, as applied to the doctrinal teaching concerning the Lord's Supper and its reception, the word "*faithful*" (in the theological language of the English Reformed Church) came to have its meaning as clearly marked and defined, by the very fact of its standing in such connexion as any word in common use, which, being capable of two senses, is capable (ordinarily and naturally) of one only, when used in one connexion.

Curious eccentricities of language will sometimes come up: and possibly some example may be found of an exceptional use of this word. Though I think I may say, with some confidence, that I never met with one. But if found, it can only be regarded as an eccentricity, and can never avail to affect the meaning of the word, as thus used, in an authorised formulary of our Church.

There is no fear of "*fine*," when applied to *silk*, being understood as equivalent to *not wet*, though it would mean *that*, applied to the weather. Its meaning is not doubtful because it is spoken of *silk*. So of "faithful" here. Its meaning is not doubtful, because it is spoken of Eucharistic reception. I will venture to ask Mr. Cobb, or Mr. Grueber or any one who maintains the contrary, to bring forward any one passage from any one approved divine of the English Reformed Church, taking in fifty years before and fifty years after the date of this addition to the Catechism,—to bring forward, I say, any one passage where the word "*faithful*" is thus applied to the subject of Eucharistic Reception, and can be shown clearly to bear the sense now claimed fo

t here. Doubtless, to say this may seem very bold, perhaps even, very presumptuous. Of course, I should not say it, f I were not strongly convinced that fair investigation of his subject will tend to confirm my position. If, however, I am wrong, let me be shewn to be wrong. I hope I shall be found quite ready to acknowledge my error, so far as I may be convicted of error; and to correct any false impression, so far my words may have conveyed any impression not strictly true.

I must not, however, be misunderstood. I will not be so rash as to deny positively that any such example can exist. will not be so presumptuous as to affirm that no passage an possibly be brought forward with Mr. Cobb's meaning. But I do express a firm conviction that whatever may be lleged in support of the other sense, must weigh *very light ndeed* against the *enormous preponderance* of passages which ill support the strict sense of "*faithful.*"

Sure I am, that if Mr. Cobb enters carefully on the vestigation, he will soon find himself surrounded by numerable passages which can clearly bear only the strict nse.* And I will be bold enough to express a very full rsuasion, that if any passage should be found bearing the her sense, it will be so like a sort of "*lusus naturæ*,"†

* To this may be added that "All the numerous Commentaries on e Catechism that have ever been written by archbishops, bishops, d divines of all views and parties, have agreed in interpreting the rds as referring to true believers." (See Goode on Eucharist, l. ii., p. 754.)

† That Overall meant the word to be understood in its restricted se, will be quite clear, I think, to all who, in the extract given ove, p. 295, have marked his careful limitation of his teaching l the insertion of the words "in recto usu sacramenti, digneque ipientibus."

so like a black swan among its snow white fellows, that it could scarcely be truly and fairly regarded otherwise, than as an exception which must prove the rule.

But if this be so, then my position is made good; for the Catechism clearly limits participation to the "faithful," and the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence teach plainly, that those who thus limit the reception of the res sacramenti to *faith*, and *those who have faith*, are altogether falling short of the true doctrine of the Eucharist.

APPENDIX.

Note A., p. 304.

How entirely Laud's declared doctrine fell short of the Real Objective Presence, may be seen in his "Conference with Fisher." In the matter of "the Real Presence," he claims to stand with Calvin, and says, "The Church of England is Protestant too. So *protestants of all sorts* maintain a true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist." (Page 247. See also p. 241, 246, 248. Edit. Oxford., 1839.)

To this "Real Presence" of all Protestants, he regarded the *Consubstantiation* of the Lutherans not less than the *Transubstantiation* of Romanists as an unwarrantable addition. (Page 241.)

He appeals as in support of his own view to the words of Cranmer, "If you understand by this word *really, reipsa;* that is, in very deed and effectually; so Christ, by the grace and efficacy of His passion, is indeed and truly present, etc. But if by this word *really* you understand *corporaliter*, corporally in His natural and organical body, under the forms of bread and wine, it is contrary to the holy word of God." (p. 248.)

In like manner he appeals to the language of Frith and Ridley, and then he adds, "And for Calvin, he comes no whit short of these, against the calumny of the Romanists on that behalf. Now after all this, with what face can A. C. say (as he doth) that Protestants deny or doubt of the true and real presence of Christ in the Sacrament?" (p. 249.)

"ALL *sides*" he says, "*agree* in the faith of the Church of England, that in the most blessed Sacrament the worthy receiver is BY HIS FAITH made *spiritually* partaker of the true and real body and blood of Christ, truly, and really, and of all the benefits of His passion." (See p. 241.) By Christ's body and blood he means His body as crucified, and His blood "shed and poured out, and so severed from the body." (See p. 256.)

Compare the Heading of Ch. II. of Bishop Cosin's History of Transubstantiation, "The *unanimous consent of* ALL PROTESTANTS with the Church of England in maintaining a REAL, that is, TRUE, but NOT a *carnal*, Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament

proved by Public Confessions and the best of authorities," And see especially sect. 21.

The Bishop of Llandaff writes, "That he [Cosin] did not hold the Objective Theory when he wrote the history [of Transubstantiation] is proved by the fact that among the English Divines whom he quotes in order to prove 'clarissime,' as he says, 'that the Protestant Churches, our own among the number, a prisca et Catholica fide nullatenus recessisse' (H. T. 11, v.), he particularly mentions Hooker, whose words I just now quoted: words than which none could be more directly at variance with that Theory." (Bishop of Llandaff's Charge, 1869, p. 128.)

In the matter of the Sacrifice, Laud says, "In the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices; one by the priest only; that is the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death, *represented in bread broken and wine poured out*," [for which he quotes, among other similar testimonies, Jewel's words "not in respect of any *corporal* or fleshly *presence* that is imagined to be there without bloodshedding, but for that it *representeth* and *reporteth* to our *minds* that one and everlasting sacrifice that Christ made in His body upon the Cross"]; another by the priest and the people jointly, and that is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and grace, we receive by the precious death of Christ; the third, by every particular man for himself only: and that is the sacrifice of every man's body and soul. . . . . Therefore it is safest to . . . . leave the Church of Rome in this particular to her superstitions." (p. 257-8.)

The Conference with Fisher must represent Laud's matured views. In his last will he directs the Conference to be "translated into Latin and sent abroad," adding "that the Christian world may see and judge of my religion." (See Keble on Eucharistical Adoration, edit. 1867, p. 157; and Laud's Works, Anglo Cath. Lib., vol. iv., p. 449.)

All this is alleged NOT as evidence that the "Real Presence" of Laud and Cosin did *not* differ *at all* from the doctrine of Calvin and Jewel and "all Protestants;" but *as conclusive evidence* that it DID *differ very widely indeed* from what is now taught as the "Real Objective Presence." On Calvin's doctrine, see Abp. Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 57, sqq., and Waterland, vol. iv., p. 60, 61. On

Abp. Laud's doctrine, see Abp. Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 70. 71.

It may, I think, serve to correct much serious misapprehension, if I append some valuable remarks of Mr. Garbett, respecting the position and teaching of the Divines of the school of Laud. "It arose from the position they occupied, that the Anglo-Catholic Divines delighted to use to the utmost possible extent, the glowing language and broad epithets which many of the primitive Fathers had applied to the Sacraments.

The Reformers avoided many of these phrases, because of the abuse of them during later periods of the Church. The Anglo-Catholic Divines, anxious to identify themselves as closely as possible with the early Fathers, ostentatiously adopted and defended them. They did not scruple to call the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, and the ministry a sacerdotal Priesthood: they occasionally used the phrase 'Real Presence,' which had been carefully avoided in the formularies of the Church, and they talked loftily of priestly absolution. But at the same time they guarded their statements by rigid limitations of the utmost possible importance. Thus, for instance, they are very careful to explain the figurative mode in which alone the early Fathers spoke of our seeing and touching Christ in the Lord's Supper, as Bishop Bramhall points out in the quotation given on page 51 of this publication. They explain, that when they called the Lord's Supper an oblation, they mean what the early Fathers meant, not an oblation of the body and blood of Christ, but an Eucharistical oblation of God's creatures—of bread and wine as an offering of praise to God, as Thorndike, for instance, explains in the quotation given on page 34. They declare that the bread and wine are but signs and representations of the body and blood, and that it is only by a figure of speech that they apply to the sign or representation, what is properly true only of the thing signified and represented, as is seen in the quotation from Bishop Cosin, on page 53. They say that the Lord's Supper is a sacrifice, but not of the same kind as the one sacrifice of our Lord made upon the Cross once for all, and not to be 'repeated in any manner whatsoever,' as may be seen in the quotations from Archbishop Laud, on pp. 30, 31, and Bishop Cosin, on p. 32. . . . . .

It appears then, that in reading these writers, we must distin-

guish, but not separate, two things—their broad sweeping lofty statements of the nature and virtue of the Sacraments on one side, and the rigid qualifications with which they guarded them upon the other. The qualifications must govern all the statements, because they are added for that very purpose. It is evident that, if the statements be adopted and the qualifications rejected, a very false impression will be gained of their system of doctrine, and a very false estimate conveyed to others. A quotation from Bishop Bramhall, given on p. 32, may be adduced in illustration of this fact. Bishop Bramhall calls the Lord's Supper, 'a commemorative, impetrative, applicative sacrifice.' Standing by themselves, the words would be more than sufficiently startling. But we must read them by the light of the qualification, expressed in a few lines before. 'We profess a commemoration of the sacrifice of the Cross; and, in the language of Holy Church, things commemorated are stated as if they were then acted.' So, again, 'we acknowledge a representation of that sacrifice to God the Father.' 'What Sacrifice? Why, the Sacrifice of the Cross. 'We acknowledge an impetration of the benefit of it.' Of what? Of 'the Sacrifice of the Cross.' 'We maintain an application of its virtue.' Of the virtue of what? 'The Sacrifice of the Cross.' So that all which Bishop Bramhall meant by the words was, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a means of grace through which the benefits of the Sacrifice of Christ are applied to the faithful recipient. . . . . .

I believe that when the statements of the Laudian Divines are fairly interpreted, they are distinguished, as Johnson says, 'substantially and essentially,' from the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and equally from the doctrine of modern Sacerdotalism." (Introduction to Voices of the Church of England, pp. 10—15. See also Principles at Stake, pp. 11, 12.) The pages in the above extract refer, of course, to Mr. Garbett's book, which will be found well worthy of careful examination.

Dean Goode says, "When he [Bramhall] observes 'a true Real Presence . . . no genuine son of the Church of England did ever deny,' he only says what is freely and cheerfully admitted, nay contended for. And what he thought 'a true Real Presence' to be, may be judged of by his adding, that De La Milletiérè's special adversary Albertinus (or, Aubertin) did not deny it. And what Aubertin's

view was, I need not stop to describe." (On Eucharist, ii., p. 869. note.)

It may serve further to elucidate the real difference between Laudian and Ritualistic Theology, if I subjoin another extract from Laud's writings.

"Nor yet speak I this, as if other Protestants did not agree with the Church of England in the chiefest doctrines, and in the main exceptions which they jointly take against the Roman Church; as appears by their several confessions." (Laud's conference with Fisher. Sec. 14, p. 41. Edit. Oxford, 1839.)

And with this the reader may be glad to compare the following extract from "Articles addressed to the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury by Archbishop Sancroft." "More especially that they [the clergy] have a very tender regard to our *Brethren* the Protestant Dissenters; that upon occasion offered, they visit them at their houses, and receive them kindly at their own, and treat them fairly wherever they meet them, discoursing calmly and civilly with them: persuading them (if it may be) to a full compliance with our Church, or at least, that whereto we have already attained, we may all walk by the same rule and mind the same thing. And in order hereunto that they take all opportunities of assuring and convincing them, that the bishops of this Church are really and sincerely irreconcileable enemies to the errors, superstitions, idolatries and tyrranies of the Church of Rome; and that the very unkind jealousies which some have had of us to the contrary, were altogether groundless. And in the last place, that they warmly and most affectionately exhort them, to join with us in daily fervent prayer to the God of Peace, for an universal blessed union of all Reformed Churches, both at home and abroad, against our common enemies, and that all they who do confess the Holy Name of our dear Lord, and do agree in the Truth of His Holy Word, may also meet in one Holy Communion, and live in perfect Unity and Godly Love." (Quoted from Sparrow's Collection of Articles, Injunctions, etc.)

Note B., p. 316.

My thanks are due to the Rev. H. O. Coxe, the Librarian, and to Professor Gandell, both of whom have kindly examined for me the copy of the "Survey" in the Douce Collection in the Bodleian Library.

I have since found a copy in the British Museum. That this book contains no specific exception to the answer before us, is, perhaps, all the more striking from the fact, that the part added to the Catechism at the Hampton Court Conference is strongly objected to. It is objected to as *really* an *addition*, though brought in *nominally* as *explanations*. The "Survey" prefers Nowell's Catechism.

It says of the addition, "this doth smell more of poperie, then those questions and answers which were written by good Maister Nowell."

It questions whether the first answer may not give occasion "to believe more sacraments than two." Also whether it may not give occasion "to believe these two to be absolutely necessary."

It complains that some of the answers "be intricate." It objects to the words "They perform them by their sureties." But no objection whatever is stated to the doctrine taught concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Some particulars concerning this publication will be found in Lathbury's History of Convocation, pp. 221, 222, 224, 227.

It may tend, I hope, to confirm my argument in the text, if I add here the result of an examination of other works containing Puritan exceptions to the Book of Common Prayer. The books enumerated may be taken, I presume, as fair samples of the rest. But I must not seem to convey the impression of having made anything like a complete investigation of this sort of literature. All I can venture to say is that I have not purposely omitted anything which might be adduced as evidence in this matter; nor have I, I trust, misrepresented anything in the contents of the following books:—

(1) Smectymnus had a great name. It was written by Stephen Marshall, Edward Callamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcommen, and William Spurstow, and takes its name from their initials. "The Old Nonconformist" speaks of it as "famous for the eminent godly and learned authors of it, and especially for its own worth." (Pre-

face.) Some account of it will be found in Neal's History of the Puritans, chap. viii., vol. ii., pp. 27, seqq. It was written in answer to Bishop Hall's "Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament." It was reprinted in 1654 under the title "Smectymnus Redivivus" with an address "To the Reader" by Thomas Manton, who speaks of it as "penned by several worthy Divines of great note and fame." It is concerned with "The *Liturgy* and *Episcopacy*." Of the Liturgy it writes very bitterly, complaining that "many things therein contained are stumbling blocks before the feet of many: such as these"—(p. 9) enumerating matters objected to. Among these there is nothing said against the teaching of the Catechism. And the exceptions are of generals, rather than of details. It complains, however, (p. 70) of the use (by the late Innovators) of the words, *Altar*, *Priest*, *Sacrifice*. It has a postscript, in which also, there is nothing said against the teaching of the Catechism.

Bishop Hall replied to Smectymnus; in consequence of which was published "A Vindication of the Answer to the humble Remonstrance from the unjust imputation of frivolousness and falshood, wherein the cause of Liturgy and Episcopacy is further debated." I have only a very imperfect copy of this, but I see no indications of any exception taken to the doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper.

(2) "A motion humbly presented to the consideration of the Honourable the Committee of the High Court of Parliament. Consisting of 18 queres, concerning the Booke of Common Prayer. October 8, 1641."

At the conclusion, it is said "Many other quærees concerning Matrimony, and concerning Visitation of the Sick and the Buriall of the dead, and the Churching of women might be made."

But no objection is made, and nothing is said of any exception which might be taken, to any answer in the Catechism concerning the Lord's Supper.

(3) "Directions propounded and humbly presented to the High Court of Parliament, concerning the Booke of Common Prayer and Episcopal Government, written by a Reverend and learned Divine now resident in this city, London, 1641." This contains moderate proposals for some alterations, but makes no mention of Catechism. It is very short.

(4) "A trial of the English Lyturgie, wherein all the materiall objections raised in Defence hereof are fully cleared and Answered, London, 1643." This contains nothing concerning the teaching of the Catechism.

(5) "Certain Queres concerning the Booke of Common Prayer, and divers other Articles of Religion, propounded to a Reverend Divine of the City of London, and his modest reply unto the same." London, 1643." The answers in this book point to some things as faulty in the Prayer-book: and speaks of "the great inconveniency which hath followed this booke," but makes no objection to the Catechism.

(6) "A short sober pacific examination of some exuberances in, and ceremonial appurtenances to the Common Prayer, etc., by William Prynne, Esq., a Bencher of Lincolns Inne."

A large portion of this book is taken up with the subject of vestments. Among the objections alleged against the Liturgy I can find nothing against the teaching of the Catechism.

(7) "The first search after one grand cause of the wrath of God yet against his people, in the use of the so much Idolized Liturgie, or Common Prayer." 1644.

This is a short pamphlet and does not much enter into particulars. It contains nothing against the answer of the Catechism.

(8) "LIX. exceptions against the Booke of Common Prayer," May 28th, 1644. This pamphlet contains objections to the Interrogatories in Baptism (p. 3) to the words of the Catechism "That the Sonne of God hath redeemed all mankind."

It objects also "The Catechism (in delivering the number of the Sacraments) saith, there are two onely as generally necessary to salvation." But it contains no objection to the teaching of the Catechism concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

(9) "A debate concerning the English Liturgy, both as established in and abolished out of the worship of God. Drawn out in two English and two Latin Epistles written betwixt Edward Hyde Doctor in Divinity, and John Ley, Rector of the Church of Solyhull in Warwickshire," 1656. This John Ley was one of the Westminster Assembly of Divines; and this book was published by him in defence of the assembly and against the Liturgy. It contains besides the English and Latin letters a preface, and twelve sections of

animadversions by Ley. It contains reference to the Hampton Court Conference (p. 58) and strictures on the Liturgy (p. 22) but takes no exception, I believe, to any part of the teaching in the Catechism.

(10) "Common Prayer Book no Divine Service by Vavasor Powell," 1660. This contains objections (p. 21) to the words of delivery in the Communion Service—(to the second part "Take and eat this, etc.," as well as to the first part "Preserve thy body," etc.) It objects to the second answer in the Catechism. It objects also to the answer "Two only, as generally necessary to salvation." But no objection is alleged to the teaching concerning the Lord's Supper.

(11) "The old non-conformist touching the Book of Common Prayer and Ceremonies," 1660. This contains—(a) An abridgement of the "Abridgement of that Book which the ministers of Lincoln Diocese delivered to his Majesty King James, the first of December last, being the first part of an Apology for themselves and their brethren that refuse the subscription and conformity which is required, printed in the year 1605." Here is to be found, I believe, no objection to the words of the Catechism. (b.) "A Short Table of Sundry other Exceptions which we propose, if God give means and opportunity to justify and confirm in the same manner, as we have done those handled in the Abridgement."

Here are found exceptions to the answer "Two only as generally necessary to salvation," (p. 24), to the words "that infants perform faith and repentance by their sureties" (p. 24) to the words "hereby made children of grace" (p. 25) but no exception to the teaching of the Catechism on the Lord's Supper.

(12) "The Common Prayer-book unmasked, wherein is declared the unlawfulnesse and sinfulnesse of it, by several undeniable arguments now newly reprinted, 1660." Of this chap. iv. treats "of the matter contained in it." There is nothing objected to the teaching of the Catechism on the Lord's Supper.

(13) "Common Prayer-book Devotions, Episcopal Delusions; or, The Second Death of The Service-book. Wherein, the unlawfulness (with advantage) of the Imposition of Liturgies, or stinted Forms of Prayer, or of the Worship of God (and more especially of the *English* Service Book) is clearly and plainly demonstrated from the Scrip-

tures, and grounds in Reason," 1666. This contains, I believe, no stricture on the teaching of the answer before us.

(14) To these may be added, "The Harmony between the Old and Present Non-conformists Principles, in Relation to the Terms of Conformity, with Respect both to the Clergie, and the People. Wherein a short History of the Original of the English Liturgy, and some Reasons why several truly Conscientious Christians cannot joyn with the Church in it. Humbly Presented to Publick Consideration in order to the obtaining some necessary Relaxation and Indulgence. To which are added some Letters that pass'd between the Lord Cecil, and Arch-Bishop Whitgift." London, 1682.

This contains five pages on the subject of the Sacraments, taken almost entirely from another publication entitled "The Altar of Damascus," (pp. 12—16.) But I find nothing alleged against the teaching of our Catechism concerning the Eucharist.

It does not appear (so far as we may gather from Neal's statement concerning it) that any objection to this answer appeared in the Abridgment of the Apology of the Lincolnshire ministers presented to the king, Dec. 1, 1604. (Neal's History of Puritans, vol. i., pp. 426—430); nor in the treatise of Bradshaw entitled "English Puritanism" (Neal's History of Puritans, vol. i., pp. 432—437.)

Neither of these books have I been able to meet with.

Neal makes mention (vol. ii., p. 27) of two pamphlets entitled "A comparison between the Liturgy and the Mass-book;" and "Service Book no better than a Mess of Pottage." But I have not been able to find either of them.

I shall be glad to add to or to correct any statement made here or in the text, if any person, possessing more familiar acquaintance with such writings, will furnish information such as, in any way, materially to affect my argument.

The general character of the works published by the Puritans against the Prayer-book appears to me fully to justify what is said by Mr. Perry;—

"It seems to have been more with respect to some special points connected with the administration of the holy rite, the kneeling posture, the use of private communions, etc., that the Puritans differed from the Church than as to the doctrine of the Sacrament itself." (Perry's History of the Church of England, vol. i., p. 24.)

Note C., p. 338.

It may be thought right to give some few examples to support the assertions here made :—

I. As to the *res sacramenti* being received, not from the hands of the earthly minister, but from above, and from a Divine Person :—

(a.) "He (our Redeemer and Saviour Christ) it is that feedeth continually all that belong unto Him with his own flesh that hanged upon the cross, and giveth them drink of the blood flowing out of his own side." (Cranmer in Preface to Lord's Supper, p. 7.) Compare p. 170, where he allows the saying, that "He (Christ) giveth His body in the Sacrament to such as worthily receive it."

"He (Christ) giveth His own flesh spritually to feed upon." (Ibid, p. 35.)

"Grace is given by the Sacrament; but as by an instrument. The inward virtue and Christ give the grace through the Sacrament." (Ridley's Works, p. 239.)

"Christum asserimus, vere sese præsentem exhibere in Sacramentis suis : in baptismo, ut eum induamus : in Cœnâ, ut eum fide et spiritu commedamus, et de ejus cruce ac sanguine habeamus vitam æternam." (Jewel's Apologia. Cambridge Edit.; p. 31.)

"The Lord doth in very deed give the same thing that he doth represent, and so that we do unfeignedly receive the body and blood of Christ." (Coverdale's Translation of Calvin, in Fruitful Lessons, etc., p. 461.)

"In the Supper Christ giveth unto us the very substance of His body and blood, that we may with full right possess him." (Ibid, 441.)

"That saving grace which Christ originally is or hath for the general good of His whole Church; by Sacraments He severally *deriveth* into every member thereof." (Hooker; Keble Edit., vol. ii., p. 258.)

Compare Calvin :—"If by the breaking of the bread our Saviour doth represent the participation of His body, it is not to be doubted but that He truly gives and confers it." (Quoted in Cosin's Works, vol. iv., p. 168.)

Again :—"He bids me take, eat, and drink, His body and blood which is His Holy Supper He offers me under the symbols of bread

and wine: I make no scruple but He doth reach them to me, and I receive them." (Ibid, p. 168.)

Compare Bishop Morton:—"How much more real is the *gift, and receipt* of that benefit, which exhibited unto us in corporal elements, hath the *donor* CHRIST, who is the eternal Son of God; the gift, His precious and glorious body, which is the everlasting ransom of his elect, and is received by faith." (Catholic Appeal, lib. ii., ch. ii.; sect. 28, p. 131.)

So Jackson:—"The food of life is no other than Christ's body and blood; and it is our High Priest HIMSELF which must give us this food." (Dean Jackson's Works, vol. ix., p. 594; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

Compare Bishop Bayly:—"The *outward signs* the *pastor gives* in the Church, and thou dost eat with the mouth of thy body; the *spiritual grace* CHRIST *reacheth from heaven*, and thou must eat it with the mouth of thy faith." (Quoted in Goode on Eucharist, vol. ii., p. 921.)

So Dr. Waterland:—"It is HE (Christ) that now sanctifies the symbols, as He then did, and, as it were, presides over our eucharistical services, making the bread to become *holy*, which before was *common*, and GIVING *the true food* to as many as are qualified to receive it, along with the *symbolical*." (Vol. iv., p. 534.)

(b.) Sometimes God the Father is spoken of as the Giver; for example:—"We thank Thee, most gentle and merciful Father, that Thou hast vouchsafed this day of Thine own goodness to feed us with an heavenly meat, even with that very body and blood of Thy most entirely beloved Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ." (Becon, Early Writings, p. 120.)

Hutchinson says:—"We receive Christ's body . . . . from heaven from the right hand of the Father; not out of the bread, nor in the bread." (Works, p. 35.)

"Grace is a consequent of Sacraments, a thing which accompanieth them as their end a benefit which he that hath receiveth from GOD HIMSELF, the Author of Sacraments." (Hooker; Keble Edit., vol. ii., 257.)

"All receive not the grace of God which receive the Sacraments of His grace. Neither is it ordinarily His will to bestow the grace of Sacraments on any, but by the Sacraments; which grace also they that receive by Sacraments or with Sacraments, *receive* it from HIM and NOT *from* THEM." (Ibid, p. 258.)

[Compare St. Augustine:—"Semper dei est *illa gratia* et Dei Sacramentum, hominis autem *solum ministerium;* qui si bonus est, adhæret Deo, et operatur cum Deo; si autem malus est, operatur *per illum* DEUS visibilem sacramenti *formam*, IPSE autem donat *invisibilem gratiam*." (Quoted in Goode on Eucharist, vol. i., p. 254.)]

We take Baptism and the Eucharist . . . . (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual whereby GOD when we take the Sacraments, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life which grace the Sacraments represent or signify." (Hooker, vol. ii., p. 258.)

"As for the Sacraments, they really *exhibit;* but for ought we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really nor do really contain in themselves that *grace* which with them or by them it pleaseth GOD to *bestow*." (Ibid, p. 352, 353.)

"In the Eucharist we so receive the gift of God, that we know by grace what the grace is which GOD giveth us." (Ibid, p. 348.)

Again:—"Grace is a consequent of Sacraments, a thing which accompanieth them as their end, a benefit which he that hath *receiveth from God himself the Author of Sacraments*, and not from *any other* NATURAL or SUPERNATURAL *quality* in them." (Ibid, p. 257.)

"So Bishop Lake:—"As He [Christ] gave Himself *for us*, so did He give Himself *to us:* for us on the Cross; to us in the sacrament." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, "De Tempore," p. 172; Edit. 1629.)

So writes Hammond:—"In that Sacrament GOD really bestows, and every faithful prepared Christian as really and truly receives the body and blood of Christ. As truly as the bishop or presbyter gives me the sacramental bread and wine, so truly doth God in heaven bestow upon me in earth the body and blood of Christ, *i. e.*, the crucified Saviour; not by local motion, but by real communication; not to our teeth, but to our souls; and consequently exhibits, makes over, reaches out unto us all the benefits thereof; all the advantages that flow to us from the death of Christ." (Practical Catechism. Works, p. 13. Edit. 1684.)

Again:—"That the faithful do receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament; which implies not any corporal presence of Christ on the table or in the elements, but GOD'S communicating the crucified Saviour (who is in Heaven bodily, and nowhere else) to us sinners on the earth." (Ibid, p. 126.)

So Bishop Nicholson:—"The Apostle intends to assert and assure

a worthy communicant, that as verily as he eats the bread with his mouth, and takes down the wine, so verily GOD IN HEAVEN bestows on him, and communicates unto him the body and blood of his Saviour, and the benefits of that body and blood which in two words, are pardon and grace." (Exposition of Catechism; Oxford Edit., 1866, p. 222.)

Compare Brevint:—"When I look upon the minister, who by special order from God his Master distributes this *bread* and this *wine*, I conceive that thus verily GOD HIMSELF hath both given once His Son to die, and *gives still* the virtue of His death to bless and to save every soul that comes unfeignedly to Him." (Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, p. 9; Edit. Oxford, 1673.)

Bishop Morton quotes Bellarmine as witnessing that the Protestants teach that, "Although the body of Christ be still in heaven, yet is it received in this Sacrament; first, sacramentally by bodily mouths, in receiving the bread, the sign of Christ his body; and by which GOD doth truly, albeit sacramentally, *deliver* unto the *faithful* the real body of Christ, and secondly spiritually to the mouth of the soul by faith, and so they truly and really participate of the substance of the body and blood of Christ." (On Eucharist: Book iv., chap. 1, sect. 3, pp. 214, 215.)

[Compare Calvin:—"Hic notandum est, quod externâ actione figurat ac testatur minister, DEUM *intus peragere:* ne ad hominem mortalem trahatur quod Deus sibi uni vindicat. Id etiam prudenter admonet Augustinus. Quomodo (inquit) et Moses sanctificat et Deus? Non Moses pro Deo: sed Moses visibilibus Sacramentis per ministerium suum, Deus autem invisibili gratia per Spiritum Sanctum." (Calvin; Institutes, lib. iv., cap. xiv., § 17, p. 461; Edit. 1618.)]

(c.) Sometimes also God the Holy Ghost is spoken of as the Giver: for example:—

"When the minister delivereth unto me *the thing that is in his power to deliver*, to say, the bread and wine, rehearsing the words of Christ's institution, THE HOLY GHOST *delivereth unto my faith*, which is mounted and ascended into heaven, the precious body and blood of my Saviour Jesus Christ spiritually, and not corporally." (Hooper Early Writings, p. 191.)

"When we rightly receive the Lord's Supper, with the very divine nourishment of His body and blood . . . . . *given to us by the work*

of the HOLY GHOST, and received of us by faith, as the mouth of our soul, we are continually fed and sustained to eternal life." (Nowell's Catechism; p. 214.)

Compare Archbishop Sharp:—"When, therefore, our Church, speaks of the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament, she means that the HOLY SPIRIT of Christ is present in the ordinance, to *apply* to every faithful communicant all the benefits of Christ's sacrifice." (Quoted in Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 61.)

So Bishop Jeremy Taylor:—"These are indeed conveyed to us by the several ministries of the Gospel, but especially in the Sacraments, where the word is preached and consigned, and THE SPIRIT is the TEACHER and the FEEDER, and makes the table full, and the cup to overflow with blessing." (Vol. viii., p. 24.)

So Bishop Lake:—"The proper *Exhibiter* of the heavenly [thing] is the Holy Spirit, and the Receiver is our faith." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, "De Tempore," p. 168; Edit. 1629.)

[After making many quotations from ancient doctors, the *Consensus Orthodoxus* of Gualter says: "Docemur hinc et admonemur, velut visibili verbo, corporalibus, et externis symbolis seu ritibus, res spirituales, et intelligibilia dona, non tantum significari et adumbrari, set etiam simul offerri, et secreta divinæ ordinationis dispositione, in operanda et dispensanda fideliam salute, *per Spiritum Sanctum exhiberi* omnibus, qui hisce corporalibus et externis symbolis, juxta institutionem Christi, in fide utuntur." (Page 317, 318; Edit. 1605.)]

II. As to the taking and receiving being by faith as the hand and mouth of the soul:—

"I say, that Christ giveth himself to be eaten, chewed, and digested; but all is *spiritually* with faith, not with mouth." (Cranmer on the Lord's Supper, p. 15.)

"They say that Christ is received in the mouth, and entereth in with the bread and wine: . . . We say that He is received in the heart, and entereth in by faith." (Ibid, p. 57.)

He [Christ] . . . . is holden of the godly . . . . with the *hand* of the heart, and by inward drinking is received." (Ridley's Works, p. 223.)

"I say, Christ understood it not of the bodily mouth, but of the

mouth of the spirit, mind, and heart." (Latimer; Remains, p. 266.)

"He doth testify, that as verily as we receive the bread with the hands, and chew the same with the teeth and tongue . . . . . even so by *faith*, (which is in place of *hands* and *mouth* to the soul,) we verily receive the true body, and the true blood of Christ, our only Saviour." (Rogers on Articles, p. 288.)

"The body of Christ is not eaten with the bodily mouth, but only by faith, which is the spiritual mouth of the soul." (Jewel; Apology and Defence, p. 531.)

"Spiritually and with the mouth of our faith we eat the body of Christ and drink His blood, even as verily as His body was verily broken, and His blood verily shed upon the cross." (Jewel; Sermon and Harding, p. 448.)

"By the *hand of faith* we reach unto Him, and by the *mouth of faith* we receive His body." (Jewel; "Harding Thessal; &c." p. 1119.)

"Thy faith must reach up into heaven. By faith He is seen, by faith He is touched, by faith He is digested." (Sandys's Sermons, p. 89.)

"His body and blood; . . . . received of us by faith, as the mouth of the soul." (Nowell's Catechism, p. 214.)

"All this thou dost well understand. For methinketh the meaning is: that faith is the mouth of the soul, whereby we receive this heavenly meat." (Catechism of Edward VI., p. 33.)

"Behold the holy body and blood of thy God; honour it; wonder at it; touch it (not with thy bodily mouth, but) with thy mind; receive it (not with thy bodily hand, but) with the hand of thy heart; and specially take it with thy inner taste." (Jewel's Rendering of Eusebius Emissenus. Apology and Defence, p. 549. Compare Homilies, p. 400.)

"A man is shaped of two parts, of the body and of the soul; and each of them hath his life, and his death, his mouth, his teeth, his food, and abstinence . . . . How . . . . then will you feed the soul? Doubtless, not by the instrument of the body, but of the soul; for that which is received into the body hath no passage from thence into the soul . . . . And whereas you say that the spirit hath no mouth . . . . you are deceived, for the spirit hath a mouth, in his kind . . . . Wherefore, whoso will be relieved by

the body of Christ, must receive Him as He will be received, with the instrument of faith appointed thereunto." (Grindall; Remains p. 45, 46.)

"The natural body of Christ is only in heaven; and, notwithstanding, the soul of the faithful communicant, with her *mouth*, that is to say, with *faith*, doth truly and unfeignedly feed upon it unto her great joy and comfort . . . . *Faith* then is the *mouth* of the soul, wherewith Christ is received and eaten." (Becon's Catechism, p. 295.)

So Jackson:—"Faith then is as the mouth or appetite by which we receive this food of life." (Dean Jackson's Works, vol. ix., p. 594, Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

Again:—"Faith is as the mouth or organ by which we receive the medicine." (Ibid, p. 611.)

And so Bishop Lake:—"We ourselves consist of an earthly and an heavenly part: We must bring both parts into the feast, and there use them both; our bodies must *take*, *eat*, and *drink* the elements; our souls must *take*, *eat*, and *drink* the body and blood of Christ." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, p. 173; Edit. 1629.)

With these examples compare the following:—

"That the same true and substantial body of Christ is present with my mind in the Supper, where it is most efficacious, I cannot deny, since it is beyond dispute, that it is really communicated to the minds of the faithful, and is really perceived by them, for it is seen by the eye of the believing mind, or the inner man, and is *taken by by the hand* and *eaten by the mouth of the same*." (Letter of H. Zanchius to Grindal in Zurich Letters ii., 100.)

"As faith is an eye unto which things to come are present, so it is a *hand* holding them, a *mouth* feeding upon them, and a *stomach* receiving them, and uniting them unto the person that believeth." (Dr. Mayer's Exposition, quoted in Goode on Eucharist, p. 699. See also pp. 700, 701.)

Compare also the following from Swinnock:—

"Faith must receive Christ, and apply him to thy soul. When thou puttest forth the hand of thy body to take the bread and wine, do thou put forth the *hand* of *faith* to *receive* the body and blood of Christ. This is one principal act of faith, like Joseph of Arimathea, to take Jesus down from the cross and lay Him in the new tomb of thine heart." (Swinnock's Christian Man's Calling: Works, vol. i, p. 205.)

Note D., p. 339.

Compare the following from Ursinus:—

"There is in the Lord's Supper a double *meat* and drink. One *external*, visible and terrene, namely bread and wine; and another *internal*. There is also a double *eating* and receiving; an external and *signifying*, which is the corporal receiving of the bread and wine; that is, which is performed by the hands, mouth, and senses of the body; and an *internal*, *invisible*, and *signified*, which is the fruition of Christ's death, and a spiritual ingraffing into Christ's body; that is, which is not performed by the hands and mouth of the body, but by the Spirit and faith. Lastly, there is a double *administer* and dispenser of this meat and drink; an *external*, of the external, which is the minister of the Church, delivering by his hand the bread and wine; and an *internal*, of the internal meat, which is Christ himself, *feeding us by his body and blood*." ("Summe of Christian Religion, by Z. Ursinus." London: 1633. Page 470.)

Compare also this from the "Harmonia Confessionum."

"Sic enim unica est sacræ Cœnæ actio, ut tamen partim corporalis sit, et in terris peragatur (cujus respectu non dubitamus Christi corpus dicere, a nobis tam procul, quam cœlum a terris, abesse) partim cœlestis, ac mente et fide cor sursum subvehente, perficiatur: Cujus habita ratione præsentissimum esse in Cœna, menti et fidei nostræ Domini corpus agnoscimus." ("Harmonia Confessionum." Obser: 2, p. 144. Geneva, 1581.)

The following extracts from Beza will be found not only to illustrate the sacramental signification spoken of, but also to have a remarkable resemblance to the teaching of our Catechism.

"Panis est Sacramentum, id est, sigillum et nota veri corporis Jesu Christi . . . . Vinum . . . . veri sanguinis ipsius pro nobis effusi: fractio panis ostendit pretiosum corpus Domini Magnis Cruciatibus confractum fuisse: vini effusio, sanguinis effusionem: Minister vero panem et vinum nobis donans, repræsentat nobis Jesum Christum Semetipsum nobis donantem. Quòd verò panem et vinum *recipimus*, *edimus*, *bibimus:* testatur . . . . ut eum Spiritualiter *amplectamur*, et tamen *verissimè*, illum scilicet *nostrum cibum*

in vitam æternam: *sicut panem et vinum* corporeo modo et visibili manducando, *corpus nostrum alitur et sustentatur in hac vita.* Non enim dubitamus quin Deus quod per Verbum suum promittit et per Sacramenta offert, *verè credentibus exhibeat.*" (Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 84.)

"Inde fit, ut quum sola symbola manu accipiantur, et ore sumantur, tamen illud quoque quod præter symbola verè offertur, et solâ fide spiritualiter percipitur, *Accipi, Comedi, Bibi* dicatur." (Vol. i., p. 209.)

"Neque *hæc tantum* symbola, sed etiam præter illa, corpus suum et sanguinem nobis offert fruendum hanc possidendum in vitam æternam, quam ex eo nobiscum communicato haurimus." (Vol. i., p. 209.)

"Id est, non imaginarium aliquod corpus, nec fictus sanguis, sed illud ipsum corpus quod traditum est pro nobis, et illi ipse sanguis pro nobis fusus, quorum simus *vere* per fidem participes, sicut symbola verè testantur." (Vol. i., pp. 209, 210,—see p. 624.)

Compare also the following from Beza's Catechism:—

"Qu. *Quid in Cœna Domini vides?*

R. Panem et vinum, quæ præbentur juxta Dei præscriptum.

"Qu. *Quid tibi panis hic et hoc vinum significant?*

R. Panis, corpus pro me crucifixum, vinum sanguinem pro me effusum mihi significant.

"Qu. *Quorsum?*

R. Ut testentur mihi ac confirment, sicut huic pani atque huic vino attributæ sunt nos in vita conservandi partes, ita Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum corpus suum et sanguinem suum pro me dedisse, et seipsum mihi dare ut ab ipso in me vita æterna promanet." (Tract. Theol., vol. i., p. 693.)

The following quotations will show how firmly Beza held the truth of the real giving and receiving, not merely of the benefits, but of the *res sacramenti* itself.

"Neque putamus nos posse donorum et virtutis Christi participes fieri, nisi id ipsum in primis possideamus." (Beza: Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 216.)

"Quasi qui virtutem illam vivificam Christi dicit ad nos ex Christi carne manare, carnis communicationem tollat, ac non potius ostandat cur et in quem finem nobis communicetur." (Ibid, p. 223.)

"Falso nobis tribuis quod Christum ipsum a suis donis separemus, quasi nos non oporteat ipsi in primis uniri: ut jam ad fastidium usque

declaravimus. . . . . Separas quæ individuo vinculo sunt semper conjuncta, nempe Christi corpus et sanguinem a vivifica ipsorum virtute." (Ibid, p. 227,—see p. 267.)

"In eo assentimur, quod . . . . præter panem et vinum dicis non tantum meritum et efficaciam mortis Domini, sed ipsum etiam corpus et sanguinem nobis communicari." (Ibid, pp. 259, 260,—see p. 286.)

"Iterum et iterum inculco, nos minime diffiteri veram veri corporis et sanguinis Christi κοινωνίαν, sed impanationem . . . . oppugnare." (Ibid, p. 260,—see also p. 261.)

"Jam antea millies respondi, nos quoque veram veri corporis et veri sanguinis communicationem statuere, et putidam esse calumniam quam nobis impingitis de sola sive nuda meriti et Spiritus Christi perceptione." (Ibid, p. 266,—see p. 279; and vol. ii., pp. 140, 186.)

"Quasi vero centies millies non sit *a nostris omnibus* et singulis inculcatum, quum ex una Christi carne petenda sint nobis quæcunque ad salutem et vitam æternam requirantur, ipsimet Christo prius oportere nos spiritualiter ac per fidem uniri, ac ipsius membra fieri quam ejus spiritu vivificemur: ac proinde signa hæc non esse duntaxat ipsius energiæ, sed in primis ipsiusmet corporis ac sanguinis Domini fide participandi symbola." (Ibid, vol. viii., p. 52.)

Not only did Beza thus (after Calvin) constantly teach and firmly maintain the true giving, taking, receiving, eating, and drinking of the *res sacramenti* itself (as distinguished from the fruits, effects, and benefits alone); but he allowed the language which speaks of such giving and receiving *with* or *under* the forms or signs or symbols of the elements.

He would certainly, I think, have sanctioned as *admissible* and *defensible*, the language of Foxe as quoted in Paper No. V., pp. 237, 238, and the language of the Notice at the end of the first book of Homilies. Only he would have required the receiving the *res sacramenti* UNDER the elements should be *well expounded*. His words are (after explaining why "hac formulas veremur usurpare")—"Posse tamen videtur, concordiæ causa, *Cum* et *Sub* admitti, sed non nisi adjuncta interpretatione plana et perspicua, nempe ita eas particulas esse intelligendas, non quasi caro Christi in terris statuatur, sed ut sciamus præter ipsa symbola quæ sunt in terris, Christum ipsum qui est in cœlis, verè nobis donari, *sicut symbola in terris testificantur*." (Tract Theol., Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 208.)

It may be worth while to add here, that Archbishop Leighton also (1) not only clearly taught the reception of the *res sacramenti* itself in the Lord's Supper, (2) but also admitted the expression "*under*" as applied to the symbols or elements.

The following answer from his "Short Catechism" summarizes the teaching of three answers in the Church Catechism:—

"Q. What doth the Lord's Supper signify and seal?

"A. Our spiritual nourishment growth and in Him, and transforming us more and more into His likeness, by commemorating His death, and *feeding* on *His body and blood, under* the *figures* of bread and wine." (Leighton's Works, vol. iii., pp. 417, 418; Edit. 1818.)

Let the reader be asked to compare the latter part of this answer—

(1) With the Notice at the end of the first book of Homilies, "Of the due Receiving of His Blessed Body and Blood under the Form of Bread and Wine." Has one any more of a "Real Objective" sound than the other?

(2) With the answer we are considering in our Church Catechism.

Is not the language of the Church Catechism far *less* open to the charge of teaching "the Real Objective Presence," (*a*) from its avoiding such ambiguous expressions as "*under the forms*" or "*under the figures*," (*b*) from its more guarded wording in limiting the reception to the "faithful"?

Note E., p. 341.

The writer of No. V. of Tracts for the Day, writes:—

"There is 'the body of Christ'; the person 'giving,' and the person 'taking and eating.' The person 'giving' is evidently the priest, who is enjoined by an express rubric to 'give' the Communion to the people 'into their hands." The person 'taking' is the communicant, who is to 'take and eat' what the priest hath 'given into his hand, which *the Article says* is 'the body of Christ.'" (Tracts for the Day, V., pp. 26, 27.) But if this writer will read the Article again, he will see that it never says that what *the priest gives* is the body of Christ. Nor would any of our Reformers have thought of meaning or saying such a thing, except in that sacramental language, which gives to the sign the name of the thing signified.

On such a supposition, how could it be said (in the natural and obvious meaning of the words) that the *giving, taking, and eating* is "ONLY *after an heavenly and spiritual manner*"? Surely such a giving would be (*in part*, at least) after an earthly and bodily manner.

And how, on such a supposition, could it be true (in its natural and obvious sense) that "THE *mean*, whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith"? Surely the bodily hand must be (primarily) THE *mean*, whereby *that* is received which by the bodily hand is *given*.

Mr. Machonochie writes:—"I believe, and therefore have always taught you, that the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST are *objectively* 'given' by the priest, *objectively* 'taken' by every communicant, and subjectively 'received and eaten by faith' unto salvation, by such as come to the Lord's Supper with right dispositions." (Address; January, 1867, p. 5.)

If for "objectively" we might substitute the word "sacramentally," in the sense of our Reformers (see Paper No. II., pp. 97—101), we should have here sound teaching, in harmony with all our formularies; but without such a substitution the words bear a sense which our Church (as I am persuaded) does not teach, and which would have been utterly disclaimed by our English Reformers.

The late Bishop of Salisbury appears to have been misled in the same way, when he says, "The word 'given' seems to me to be only consistent with the 'doctrine of an objective presence.'" (Charge, p. 81. See also Liddon's Memoir, "W. K. Hamilton," p. 122.)

And thus Mr. Luke Rivington says: "There are three steps—the giving, the taking, the receiving. The Lord's body therefore must, awful as is the truth, be in the priest's hands before it is in the heart of the communicant!" (Inward Part or Thing Signified, p. 9. See also Bishop Forbes on Articles, vol. ii., p. 537.)

So Mr. Cobb says in "Sequel to Kiss of Peace," p. 401; note:—"The objective character of the phrases 'given, taken and eaten,' would, to my mind, necessitate an objective sense being given to the words 'heavenly and spiritual.'"

But precisely the same English expression as in the English version of the Article—"given . . . taken, eaten,"—is found also in Nowell's Smaller Catechism, where no one will contend that it bears any *Real Objective* sense. (See above, p. 306.)

And precisely the same Latin expression as in the Latin version of the Article—"datur et accipitur"—is found also in the "Consensus Orthodoxus" of Rodolph Gualter, (see Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 623. Geneva, 1681) first published in 1578. And the following extract will satisfy any one that it bears there no *Real Objective* sense. "Non est talis præsentia corporis et sanguinis Christi in cœna ponenda et statuenda, quam spiritualis cibi et potus ratio non requirit, quæque ad verum communicationis ipsius effectum nec necessaria nec utilis est. At *spiritualis* cibi potus *ratio*, secundum quam corpus et sanguis Christi in cœnâ DATUR ET ACCIPITUR, *nullam* plane *requirit* CORPORALEM *in symbolis præsentian*, neque etiam ejusmodi præsentia vel necessaria vel utilis est ad verum atque proprium communicationis corporis et sanguinis Christi effectum." (Page 227, Edit. Zurich, 1605.)

The reader may observe that the expression here "spiritualis ratio" presents another point of coincidence with the language of our Article.

But long before this Bucer had taught, "quod . . . simul *detur* et *accipiatur* corpus Christi." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, 1535, in Works, vol. iv., p. 231. Geneva, 1581.)

Moreover, even Œcolampadius had said before "Cum pane etiam ac vino συμβολικῶς . . . et contemplatione fidei, corpus et sanguinem *tradi* et *accipi* dicimus." And he declares, "non sine summa contumelia et dolore audiamus, *non accipere* nos in Cœna *verum corpus*." (See his letter to Bucer in Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, 1530, in Works, vol. iv., p. 188. Geneva, 1581.)

That Reformed Divines—Divines distinctly opposed to the Real Objective Presence—did not hesitate to speak of "*giving*" as well as of "*reception*," will be abundantly clear to all who will refer to the the quotations given above, in pp. 381, sqq. See also p. 342.

Bishop Forbes indeed (On Articles, vol. ii., p. 558) argues that Calvin's *accipio* is *receive*, not *take*. But the "is taken" of our English Article xxviii. is the "*accipitur*" of the Latin version.

Moreover, it is to be observed that, in the very same Article, and in the very same sentence, the same word "*accipitur*" in the Latin is once rendered by the English "is taken," and once by the English "is received."

I submit, therefore, that every argument must be futile which rests

on such an assumption as this, that the two English expressions "taken" and "received" must necessarily (in the theological language of the time) convey two separate notions, having a definite and clearly marked line of distinction between them.

Further, I submit, that the claim of any such exclusively "Real Objective" sense for the English expression "taken" is abundantly refuted by the extract given from Sibbes in p. 347, as well as by several of the extracts given above in pp. 332, 333; and below, pp. 401—407.

Let me add, that Beza would admit to the *very full* the utmost meaning that can be attached to the English word "*taken*." For he speaks of the sacraments, "utpote quæ nos veluti in rem præsentem adducant, quasi Christum ipsum quodammodo manibus jam palpemus, et oculis Cernamus, et toto corpore sentiamus." (Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 26.)

Again he says—"Agnus denique ipse nobis per illa commonstratus et velut in manus traditus: spiritualis per fidem illius agni manducatio." (Vol. ii., p. 187.)

How could Beza have expressed more clearly the *reality* of that spiritual "*taking*"? This will be found, I think, to answer sufficiently what is argued from "that little word '*taken*'" in "The Kiss of Peace," pp. 22, 23; Edit. 1868.

Let it be added, that the language which Mr. Cobb quotes from Article xxviii.—"after an heavenly and spiritual manner" ("cœlesti et spirituali ratione," *Latin version*)—and which he would have to receive a "Real Objective" impress, is the very language which Beza also uses. He says:—

"Modum quidem dicimus esse *spiritualem cœlestem* divinum." (Beza: Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 275.)

Again:—"Quemadmodum *accipimus, edimus et bibimus* naturalia symbola . . . ita etiam *cœlesti et spirituali* modo Jesus Christus . . . vere nobis communicatur." (Ibid, p. 31.)

Bucer also had said, "Ego in omnibus meis scriptis testor; præcipuum in sacra Cœna esse exhibitionem corporis et sanguinis Christi realissimam, quia *cœlestem et spiritualem*. . . . Panis ostenditur et præbetur sensibus, et simul *fidei* exhibetur et traditur corpus Domini." (See his letter in Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, 1533, Works, vol. iv., p. 215. Geneva, 1581.)

But it is specially to be observed that the same expression is found

in Nowell's Smallest Catechism (see above, p. 306) where the *giving, taking, eating and drinking* are said to be "only in *a heavenly and spiritual manner*, but yet in truth."

If it be argued further that the word "eaten" at any rate is not in the "Consensus Orthodoxus," and must have an objective sense, since Bishop Forbes (On Art., vol. ii., p. 558) says—"The 'taking' and 'eating' are two distinct acts;" it will suffice to refer to the quotations in pp. 385—387, and below, pp. 412—415, for evidence to shew how constantly "eating" is spoken of as *by believing only*. Or the reader may be referred to the words quoted above (p. 322) from Jewel, speaking of the *giving indeed and verily*, of *eating verily*, and of the *drinking verily*. Or he may find in Cranmer's work "On the Lord's Supper," under the section "Of the Eating and Drinking," conclusive evidence that in the language of the English Reformation such words carried no "Real Objective" sense.

It may be observed, too, that Zwingle himself uses the word *eating* (edere) to express his own view, in the quotation given above in p. 301, and below, (in Hospinian,) p. 399.

It may be worth while, perhaps, to add the following extracts from Calvin, to shew what a *very real*, and yet what an *entirely spiritual* office was assigned to *eating* in his teaching :—

"Summa sit, non aliter animas nostras carne et sanguine Christi pasci, quam panis et vinum corporalem vitam tuentur et sustinent. Neque enim aliter quararet analogia signi, nisi alimentum suum animæ in Christo reperirent: quod fieri non potest nisi nobiscum Christus verè in unum coalescat, nosque reficiat *carnis suæ edu* et *sanguinis potu*. . . . . Si verum est præberi nobis signum visibile, ad obsignandum invisibilis rei donationem: *accepto corporis symbolo*, non minus corpus etiam ipsum nobis *dari* certò confidamus." (Instit., lib. iv., cap. xvii., § 10.)

"Si oculis animisque in cœlum evehimur, ut Christum illic in regni sui gloriâ quæramus, quemadmodum symbola nos ad eum integrum invitat, ita sub panis symbolo *pascemur ejus corpore*, sub vini symbolo distincte *ejus sanguine potabimur:* ut demum toto ipso perfruamur." (§ 18.)

"Aliud est offere, aliud *recipi*. Spiritualem hunc cibum omnibus porrigit Christus, potumque spiritualem propinat: alii avide *vescuntur*, alii fastidiosè respuunt." (§ 33.)

"Sunt qui manducare Christi carnem, et sanguinem ejus bibere, uno verbo definiunt nihil aliud esse quam in Christum ipsum credere. Sed mihi expressius quiddam ac sublimius videtur voluisse docere Christus in præclarâ illa concione, ubi carnis suæ manducationem nobis commendat: nempe vera sui participatione nos vivificari: quam manducandi etiam ac bibendi verbis ideo designavit, ne quam ab ipso vitam percipimus, simplici cognitione percipi quispiam putaret. Quemadmodum enim non aspectus sed esus panis corpori alimentum sufficit: ita vere ac penitus participem Christi animam fieri convenit, ut ipsius virtute in vitam spiritualem vegetetur. *Interim verò hanc non aliam esse quàm fidei manducationem fatemur: ut nulla alia fingi potest.*" (Lib. iv., cap. xvii., § 5.)

"Neque illi mihi satisfaciunt, qui . . . . . nos Spiritus modo participes faciunt, preterita carnis et sanguinis mentione. Quasi vero illa omnia de nihilo dicta forent, *Carnem* ejus verè esse *cibum*, *sanguinem* ejus vere esse *potum:* non habere vitam nisi qui carnem illam *manducaverit*, et sanguinem *biberit:* et quæ eodem pertinent." (§ 7.)

Very *real* also is the *spiritual* manducation taught in the "Consensus Orthodoxus," of Gualter.

"Nisi vera esset hæc, quamvis figuratè sic dicta, carnis et sanguinis Christi, quæ fideli corde suscipitur, manducatio et potatio, frustratoria esset ejus in participatione Eucharistiæ ore facta professio." (Consensus Orthodoxus, p. 204; 1605.)

"Sicut hoc de *verâ* et naturali *carne* . . . . et *non de merito*, seu *fructi carnus* intelligi omnino oportet: Ita quoque spiritualis manducatio est *ipsius veræ*, atque propriæ *carnis* Christi." (Ibid, p. 359.)

It will be seen also by references to p. 263 sqq., that the Consensus approves of the phrase "edere carnem," and of the saying "Fides edit carnem Christi, et bibit sanguinem ejus, dum credit."

I cannot but think that the reader who carefully considers the teaching of these extracts and those given above (pp. 384, 385) from Beza, will come to the conclusion that Bishop Forbes (On Articles, vol. ii., p. 558) is in error in regarding the formula of Poissy (so far as regards the words "nos *recipere* et *edere* spiritualiter et per fidem verum illud corpus quod pro nobis mortuum est") as "not a genuine 'reformed' statement;" if by this is meant, that there is anything in the words really discordant with the views of the Reformed. (See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 61.) Compare the

extract given above from the Belgian Confession (p. 327), as well as the other extracts from the Reformed Confessions.

I do not doubt, however, that Bishop Forbes is perfectly right in speaking of the *hollowness* of the attempt "to state the Calvinistic doctrine, so that it might pass with the Queen Mother, and the French politicians, and the Gallican divines." Doctrines so very widely separate from one another may be brought very near together indeed in words, but the show of reconciliation must always be utterly *hollow*.

Note F., p. 343.

I desire, however, to have it quite clearly and unmistakeably understood that what is said in the text is intended to apply, not at all to the language which *speaks*, or (to avoid misunderstanding) *prefers* to speak, of the reception and possession of *benefits;* but only to *such* language as rejects or refuses, or explains away, or (in some way or other) sets itself in opposition to, *that* language which speaks of the real beneficial donation, and reception, and possession of that which is the true "res sacramenti."

Bishop Hooper writes:—"Satis absque dubio manducat et bibit in Eucharistia qui corporis et sanguinis Christi *gratiam* efficaciter manducat et bibit, licet corporis substantiam non apprehenderit ore et ventre." (Later writings, p. 434.)

And again:—"In cœna Domini Spiritus Sanctus per verbum et externa elementa panis et vini recipientis animum per fidem corpore et sanguine Christi, vel *potius* omnibus meritis et bonis in morte sua nobis partis, pascit ac refovet." (Ibid, p. 410.)

Yet Bishop Hooper, as we have seen (see above, p. 321) in his "Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian faith." published in 1550, did not hesitate to say "I believe and confess . . . that always and as often as we use this bread and wine according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, we do verily and indeed receive his body and blood." (Later writings, p. 49.)

So also John A. Lasco manifested a decided preference for the

language which speaks of the reception of the *benefits* rather than of the "*res sacramenti*" itself.

Yet even A. Lasco did not hesitate to write, that the merits of Christ's passion and death and resurrection "ad nos pertinere nullo modo potuissent, nisi ille eorum nobis communionem in corpore et sanguine suo (a nobis hac fine accepto) gratuito (pro suâ misericordiâ) detulisset." ("De Sacramentis Ecclesiæ Christi." Fo. 47, b; London, 1552.) And again, "Neque vero ideo, quod vocem communionis passive acciendam esse dicimus, ipsam corporis et sanguinis Christi exhibitionem excludimus ab usu nostrorum sacramentorum, quæ enim esset societas, ususque communionis, si id non haberetur in quo communionem habemus: ac rursum quomodo haberetur, si non exhiberetur? fatemur igitur exhibitum nobis esse jam olim, adeoque exhiberi semper, omnium autem significantissime in usu Sacramentorum, corpus et sanguinem Christi Domini, alioqui usum illius habere non possemus, nisi exhiberetur." (Ibid, Fo. 44, b.)

Again, "In hoc . . . omnes consentiunt, quod hanc nostram cum Christo Domino communionem statuunt, in unius ejusdemque corporis et sanguinis societate seu participatione." (Ibid, Fo. 33, a.)

To those who, in our own day, can hardly bring themselves heartily to approve the language which speaks clearly of the reception of the *res sacramenti* itself, I would beg leave to submit for study and consideration, the following observations of Hospinian, on the *seeming dissent* but *real consent*, between the doctrines of Calvin and Zwingle.

"Sunt qui mediam quandam sententiam inter Lutherum et Zuinglium eum [Calvinum] docuisse affirment; sed hoc vel ex imperitiâ, vel malitia faciunt. Nam a Zuinglii sententia (si rem ipsam spectes) ne hilum quidem, quod Calvinus tradidit, discrepare, quamvis paulo planius quid in Sacramento percipiatur definiat ipse; vel summus ille et perpetuus Tigurinæ et Genevensis Ecclesiæ Consensus de re Sacramentariâ confirmat. Passim quidem inculcat Zuinglius, CÆSAM *Christi carnem nos a cæde servare*, COMESAM *nihil prodesse: veram illam ac realem carnem Christi ne spiritualiter quidem edi: carnis et sanguinis nominibus mortem ipsam significari: carnem Christi manducare nihil aliud esse quam credere*, et si quæ sunt similia. His autem contraria videtur Calvinus affirmare, *Carnem Christi* videlicet *quæ crucifixa est oportere a nobis comedi:*

VERAM SUBSTANTIAM *carnis nobis spiritualiter communicari: Christum ipsum non esse a suis donis separandum, manducationem esse fidei effectum.* Nullam autem in his esse repugnantiam, non difficile est sani judicii hominibus demonstrare. Comesam ubique carnem vocat Zuinglius ex adversariorum sensu, quæ sive sensibili sive spirituali modo in nostra corpora trajiciatur: Et recte negat hoc sensu Carnem quicquam prodesse, quoniam mactata est in ara crucis, ut semel ejus morte non autem comestione aut esu servaremur. Hoc Zuinglii dictum qui ex pravo affectu sinistrè accipiebant olim, concludebant inde, eum simpliciter negare omnem carnis manducationem, quod quidem esset ipsa Christi verba inficiari: Nec unquam illi in mentem hoc venit. Ideo comedendam etiam carnem asseruit Calvinus: sed simul quid vocabulo manducationis carnis et sanguinis Christi intelligeretur perspicue declaravit: nempe, non oris aut dentium ullam actionem, non substantiarum trajectionem, aut permixtionem, aut inter se applicationem, sive corporali sive spirituali modo factam, sed spiritualem illam κοινωνίαν, quâ fit, ut ille ipse Christus Deus et homo crucifixus pro nobis, vere noster fiat, adeo quidem arctè ut ex ipso quicquid ad salutem nostram requiritur, ipsaque adeo vita æterna in nos promanet, qui spiritualis nexus similitudine membrorum et capitis, itemque matrimonialis copulæ adumbratur. Quæ est igitur in istis repugnantia? Ejusmodi certe esum a Zuinglio minime repudiari ex scriptis ejus liquet. Nam in libro De vera et falsa Religione, et in Historia de Passione; *Christus,* inquit, *aperte docuit, spiritus esse comestionem, non oris.* Item, *Spiritualiter Edimus, quum per Dei gratiam at Christum venimus.* Item. *Pii non solum symbola dentibus premunt, sed ultra symbolorum manducationem quæ corporis fit, intus in mentibus suis corpore et sanguine Christi per fidei manducationem pascuntur.*

At objiciat aliquis, corporis et sanguinis nomine Zuinglius ubique testatur, se non ipsam carnem, sed Christi mortis efficaciam atque adeo interdum spiritum, it est spiritualem vim Christi Dei et hominis intelligere. Respondeo, ne hoc quidem Calvini sententiæ repugnare, si dextre et ex Zuinglii mente intelligatur. Quis enim eum fuisse Zuinglium existimet, qui vel Christum diviserit, vel eorum quæ Christus pro nobis implevit efficaciam ab ejusdem carne re ipsa ejunxerit, ac si fides nostra in passionem ita ferretur, ut carnem ipsam quæ passa est negligeret? Res autem sic se habet. Zuinglius

adversus sarcophagos agens, quorum duo genera esse videbat: unum eorum, qui crasso quodam modo, et ut ait Nicolaus Papa, sensualiter comedi carnem Christi sub panis et vini speciebus crederent, cujus tamen erroris ipsum quoque Cajetanum puduit: alterum eorum, qui spirituali et incomprehensibili quodam modo substantiam ipsam carnis re ipsa in pane præsentem manibus et ore sumi somniant, ex quo errore tandem natum videmus, Ubiquitatis monstrum: totus in eo fuit nimirum, ut spirituale hoc mysterium esse declararet, ideoque substantiæ ipsius esum est inficiatus, quatenus videlicet ab adversariis statuebatur. Hujus rei gratiâ Calvinus cum Zuinglii sententiam a nonnullis malè intelligi videret, ac si corpus Christi in spectrum vel certe in abstractum quiddam transformaret, quod nunquam certe illi in mentem venerat; clarius id quoque studuit explicare. Itaque fidem nostram imprimis in ipsummet Christum ferri docuit, secundario vero in ipsius merita et obedientiam, in ea denique omnia quæ ex ipso in nos, qui ipsius membra sumus, promanant. Usus est autem de industria SUBSTANTIÆ vocabulo, quoties præsertim illi cum sarcophagis negotium fuit, *partim insistens Christi vestigiis*, qui carnis, et corporis, et sanguinis nomina sic usurpavit: partim vero, ut eò dilucidius illa inter ipsummet Christum et ejus dona, sive (ut ita loquar) inter subjectum et accidentia, sive inter fundum et fructus distinctio appareret. Et certe cum ab ipso Christo pendeat (Christus autem per carnem sive in carne nobis appropinquat) quicquid ex ipso per fidem tum in verbo simplici, tum in Sacramentis spiritualiter haurimus, *majis proprie loquimur*, quum IPSAM CARNEM et IPSUM SANGUINEM, sive ipsum Christum sic ab ea parte in qua pro nobis passus est descriptum, statuimus pro re significata tum verbi simplicis, tum sacramentorum: quam quum fructum et efficaciam illius pro re Sacrament ponimus." (Historia Sacramentaria, Pars ii., Anno 1541: Hospinian's Works, vol. iv., pp. 317, 318; Geneva, 1681.)

This extract may be regarded, I think, as very important. An its value consists,—I. Not only in its pointing out clearly the rea substantial agreement doctrine between two schools (the Swiss an the Calvinistic); one of which decidedly preferred the language whic speaks of receiving *the benefits*, the other of which clung tenaciously to the language which speaks of the reception of the "res sacramenti itself,—II. But also in its containing the acknowledgment of a Swis that to speak of the reception of the body and blood of Christ them

selves is (1) to follow the example of the Great Teacher, and (2) to use that language which is, strictly speaking, the most proper language to be used on the subject.

Let it be well considered, that that which is to be regarded as the true "res sacramenti" (*i.e.*, the *body* AS *crucified*, and the *blood* AS *shed*),which is *truly given*, and *verily and indeed received* by faith, in the giving and receiving of the *sacramentum* (or outward sign), is notwithstanding the *true* sacramental union (see Harmonia Confessionum, Obser. i. in p. 127) not only, in respect of the elements, *absent*, but *distant;* and DISTANT *not in* PLACE *only, but in* TIME; though most truly present to the faith of the receiver's soul (see Harmonia Confessionum, Obser. ii. in p. 144), so as to become immediately the substantial food of its hunger, and the real refreshment for its thirst. And then it will be obvious, I think, that the *giving*, *taking*, and *receiving* can be understood *no otherwise* than "*only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner;" and that the real difference between the language (as modified) of the two schools, is a difference rather in the choice of forms of expression, than in anything more important; though, doubtless, there has been language used, on one side at least, which requires *a favourable construction* to be put upon it, before a harmony can be effected.

The language of *that* school of the Reformed, both at home and abroad, which (though utterly renouncing everything like the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence) clung to the most strictly *proper* language on the subject of the Eucharist, will be found habitually rising to the level (sometimes, I think, higher than the level) of the language of our Catechism, and of the corresponding teaching in our Articles. The same kind of language is used also, not unfrequently, by the Swiss school.

This is so important to be observed, that I will adduce here a few additional testimonies—such as, I hope, will satisfy all that such language has on it *no mark* of its being the *property* of either Romish or Lutheran doctrine.

(1) The following is the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism:—

"*Cur ergo Christus panem appellat suum corpus, calicem vero suum sanguinem, seu novum fœdus per suum sanguinem: Paulus item panem et vinum communionem corporis et sanguinis Christi?*

Christus non sine gravi causa sic loquitur: videlicet, non solum ut

nos doceat, quemadmodum panis et vinum corporis vitam sustentant, sic etiam *crucifixum* suum *corpus* et *effusum* suum *sanguinem*, vere esse animæ nostræ *cibum* ac *potum*, quo ad vitam æternam nutriatur: verum multo magis, ut hoc visibili signo ac pignore nobis certum faciat nos *non minus* VERE *corporis et sanguinis sui*, per operationem Spiritus Sancti, *participes* esse, quam sacra ista symbola, in ejus memoriam, ore corporis percipimus: tum etiam, quod ejus passio et obedientia tam certo nostra sit, quam si ipsimet pro nostris peccatis pœnas dedissemus, et Deo satisfecissemus." ("Catechesis Heidelbergensis," Qu. 79, in "Sylloge Confessionum," p. 380.)

(2) So Ursinus says,—"It is apparent that they are falsely accused who thus teach [*i.e.*, teach the *real spiritual* RECEIVING *of Christ's very* BODY ITSELF] as if they made either the bare signs only to be in the Lord's Supper, or a participation of Christ's *death* only, or of His *benefits*, or of the *Holy Ghost*, excluding the *true, real, and spiritual communion of the* VERY BODY *of Christ* ITSELF." ("Summe of Christian Religion," London, 1633, p. 471.)

(3) Again, Ursinus sets it down among the points "wherein the Churches which profess the Gospel *agree*,"—"that in the Supper we are *made partakers* not only of the Spirit of Christ and His satisfaction, justice, virtue, and operation, but also of the very SUBSTANCE *and essence* of *His true body and blood*, which was *given for us to* DEATH *on the cross*, and *which was* SHED *for us;* and are truly fed with the self-same unto eternal life." (Ibid, p. 479.)

(4) Calvin says that the *doubt* concerning the *word* SUBSTANCE is readily allayed, if we put away gross imagination of *carnal manducation*. He says that the definition must stand that we are *made* PARTAKERS *of Christ's flesh* SUBSTANTIALLY. ("De verâ participatione," etc.) His words are—"Definitio igitur statuenda erit, *Substantialiter* nos fieri *carnis* Christi *participes* . . . . . quia non secus animas nostras vivificet Christi *caro*, quoad vim et efficaciam, ac panis viniquc substantiâ corpora aluntur." Again: "Certe, veritas et res Sacramenti, *non tantum* est applicatio *beneficiorum* Christi, sed *Christus ipse* cum morte et resurrectione sua." (See Calvin's Works, vol. viii. p. 744; Amsterdam, 1667.)

A few other extracts (out of many) from Calvin's minor treatises are added.

(*a*) "Respondebimus, panem et vinum signa esse visibilia, quæ corpus et sanguinem Christi nobis repræsentant, corporis vero et sanguinis nomen eis attributum, quod sint veluti instrumenta quibus Dominus Jesus Christus nobis ea *distribuit*. . . . . Necesse est igitur, nos in Cœna VERE *corpus* et *sanguinem* Christi recipere . . . . Itaque fatendum est . . . . . quemadmodum panis in manu distribuitur, ita *corpus Christi*, ut ejus participes simus, nobis communicari. . . . . Intelligimus, Christum nobis in Cœnâ *veram propriamque. Corporis et sanguinis sui substantiam donare:* ut pleno jure ipsum possideamus, et possidendo in omnem bonorum suorum societatem vocemur." (Calvin: "De Cœna Domini." In Works, vol. viii., p. 3; Amsterdam, 1667.)

(*b*) "Fatemur, Christum quod panis et vini symbolis figurat, vere præstare, ut animas nostras *carnis suæ esu et sanguinis potione* alat. . . . . Neque enim dicimus quidquam ostendi quod non *vere detur*. Jubet nos Dominus panem et vinum accipere: interea spirituale *carnis suæ et sanguinis alimentum* se *dare* pronunciat." (Calvin's "Expositio" of the *Consensus Tigurinus*, in Works, vol. viii., p. 657.)

(*c*) "Nos *carnem* Christi et *sanguinem vere* nobis in Cœna *offerri* asserimus, ut animas nostras vivificent: nec ambigua est nostra definitio, non aliter hoc spirituali alimento, quod nobis in Cœna offertur, vegetari animas, quam corpora nostra pane terreno aluntur. *Vera* igitur *carnis et sanguinis Christi participatio* in Cœna a nobis statuitur. De voce *substantiæ* si quis litem moveat, Christum asserimus *a carnis suæ substantia* vitam in animas nostras spirare." (Calvin's "Secunda Defensio" against Westphal., in Works, vol. viii., p. 660.)

(*d*) "Non simpliciter dictum sit, Spiritus meus vere est cibus: sed *Caro mea:* nec simpliciter etiam dictum sit, Divinitas mea vere est potus: sed, *sanguis*. . . . . Distincte affirmo, quam a vobis sumpsit *carnem, eam* nobis esse vivificam." (Calvin: "De vera participatione," in Works, vol. viii., p. 726.)

(5) The ministers of Augsburg, declaring their matters of agreement with Luther, declare,—"Fatetur Lutherus . . . . Duas res in Eucharistiâ *dari*, naturâ et essentiâ suâ distinctas, nempe *panem* et *corpus Domini*, *vinum* et *sanguinem Christi*. IDEM NOS QUOQUE FATEMUR. . . . . Nobis enim anathema iunt, quicunque dicunt in Cœna Domini nudum panem et vinum offerri, neque fatentur, unicum et *verum donum* hîc esse, VERUM *corpus* et VERUM *sanguinem* Domini

imò ipsum Dominum totum atque integrum, verum Deum et verum hominem." (See Hospinian: Historia Sacramentaria, Part ii., 1533. Works, vol. iv., pp. 215, 216; Geneva, 1681.)

(6) Again: The ministers of Augsburg declare—"*veram præsentiam et manducationem* in credentibus . . . . *non minùs* plenè et perfectè *credimus et confitemur, quam Lutherus aut alius quispiam.*" (See Hospinian; Historia Sacramentaria, Part ii., 1533. Works, vol. iv., p. 218; Geneva, 1681.) And again:—"Simpliciter cum Scriptura loquimur, Dominum in Cœna *corpus* et *sanguinem suum* nobis *manducandum et bibendum dare.* Et ne quis fortè suspicetur, nos tantum imaginariam præsentiam et manducationem Christi in Eucharistiâ statuere, *vocabulum* VERE *apponimus.*." (Ibid, p. 218.)

(7) Œcolampadius declares,—"Bene et religiose loquuntur, qui se dicunt accedere ad Corpus Domini, vel manducare corpus." (See Hospinian: Historia Sacramentaria, Part ii., 1525. Works, vol. iv., p. 62; Geneva, 1681.)

(8) "Ne obscuretur vel extenuatur inæstimabile illud beneficium, in quo tota Cœnæ vis et efficacia Consistit: nempe exhiberi nobis quod figuratur. Quod fieri non potest, nisi *recipiamus* illic *Corpus* et *sanguinem* Domini, *non phantasia aut apprehensione mentis, sed reipsa* ita nobis *offerri*, ut vera substantialique unitate cum ipso cohæreamus." ("De Cœna Domini brevis admonitio" in Calvin's Works, vol. ix., p. 267. Amsterdam: 1667.)

(9) The *Syngramma Suevicum* asks in language approved then (1525) by Luther, and since by the Reformed, "Si remissio peccatorum *donum* nostrum est, cur non et *corpus* et *sanguis*, per quæ nobis hæc remissio contingit, *dona* essent?" And it says, "Jam si *dona* sunt, consentaneum est, ut et pro ratione donorum distribuantur." And it teaches "Non quispiam adventus est Christi, sicut initio carne venit, novissimo in gloria venturus, sed *doni* communicatio et distributio est." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, part ii. in Works, vol. iv., p. 14. Geneva: 1681.)

(10) And Œcolampadius in his "Anti-syngramma" says, "Si *corpus* Christi et *sanguinem* dicitis *donari* pane et vino, Sicut Rex literis suis Regnum dat et includit, quo filium *donat* . . . solis verbis dissidemus." (Ibid, p. 102.) And again, "Cum dicitis, panem intrare in ventrem, *corpus*, quod *creditur*, *intrare* in *animum* et *mentem*, nonne nobiscum sentitis?" (Ibid, p. 102.)

(11) "Quin Fideles *carne* et *sanguine* Christi *verè* et *substantialiter* in Cœna *alantur*, non nego, si tantum definiatur modus arcana Spiritus virtute fieri, ut vim suam caro et sanguis Christi in nos transfundant." (Calvin in Letter to Schalingius. See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, 1557, vol. iv., p. 425. Geneva: 1581.)

(12) "Non ullum sub elementis Cœnæ realiter delitescens corpus, aut sub vino sanguis, sed *unicum* duntaxat illud Christi *corpus* pro nobis in mortem *oblatum*, et ejus sanguis semel effusus, sunt *verus* animæ nostræ cibus et potus: quibus anima nostra *spiritualiter esuriens*, *spiritualiter pascitur*, dum *sacrificium illud Corporis et sanguinis Christi* verâ et vivâ fide per Spiritum Sanctum apprehendit." (M. Micronius, Feb. 1554. See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, 1558. Part ii., p. 405. Geneva: 1581.)

(13) The ministers of Frankfort in 1553 replying to Luther's charges, declare their teaching to be that "*Verum* suum *corpus*, et *verum* suum *sanguinem*, *verè* edendum, et bibendum, in cibum, potumque animarum, quo illæ in vitam æternam alantur, *dare* dignetur Dominus."

Again they declare "sic docere etiam sese, non dubitandum esse, quin Dominus *exhibeat* etiam *verum* et *substantiale corpus*, et *verum naturalem suum sanguinem in verum cibum* animarum nostrarum." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, part ii. in Works, vol. iv., p. 214. Geneva: 1681.)

(14) "Nos dicimus, ex Dei institutione, *corpus* quidem, panis illius traditione, ut *verum cibum: sanguinem* verò illius vini præbitione ut *verum potum* distinctè nobis mente ac fide, non ore, *sumenda dari*." ("Harmonia Confessionum," Observ. 5, in p. 145. Geneva: 1581.)

(15) "M. Atqui, nonne tunc se dedit, quum se exposuit in mortem, ut nos a mortis judicio redemptos, Patri reconciliaret?

P. It quidem verum est: sed non satis est nobis, nisi eum *nunc accipiamus:* quo mortis ejus efficacia fructusque ad nos perveniat.

. . . . . .

M. Quid ergo in symbolo panis habemus?

P. *Corpus Christi*, ut semel pro nobis ad nos Deo reconciliandos immolatum fuit, ita *nunc* Quoque nobis *dari:* ut certo sciamus, reconciliationem ad nos pertinere." (Calvin's Catechism, in Works, vol. viii., pp. 26, 27. Amsterdam: 1667.)

(16) "Quod autem *carnis suæ esu*, et *sanguinis potione*, quæ hic

figurantur, Christus animas nostras per fidem, Spiritus Sancti virtute *pascit*, id non perinde accipiendum, quasi fiat aliqua substantialis vel commixtio, vel transfusio: sed quoniam ex *carne* semel in sacrificium *oblata*, et *sanguine* in expiationem *effuso*, vitam hauriamus." (Consensus Tigurinus. Cap. xxiii.)

(17) "Ipsorum . . . . fidem et doctrinam de hoc Sacramento hanc esse, quod sentiant, in eo ex institutione et opere Domini, verè (prout verba Christi sonant) *verum corpus et verum sanguinem suam*, cum visibilibus signis, pane et vino *exhiberi*, *dari* et sumi, et sic hoc ante hoc quoque tempus *non solum Zuinglium et Œcolampadium docuisse*, sed ipsos quoque in publicis Ecclesiarum Superioris Germaniæ Confessionibus, aliisque scriptis professos esse." (Bucer at Witeberg, 1536. See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 243, a.)

(18) "Itaque præcipua hujus Sacramenti pars est *donum* Dei, nempe *corpus* et *sanguis Christi: Corpus*, inquam, illud quod pro nobis in mortem est *traditum:* et *sanguis* ille, qui in cruce *fusus* est, ad peccatorum nostrorum ablutionem. . . . . Sic ergo *corpus* Christi *verè manducatur*, Sanguisque ejus *verè bibitur* in Cœna: non tamen crasso illo atque carnali modo . . . sed spiritualiter, id est, spirituali modo et fideli mente . . . Neque negamus *corpus et sanguinem* Christi in sacra Cœna tanquam *verum* animæ *cibum percipi*, ac *manducari* in vitam æternam." (Letter of the Swiss to Luther concerning the *Concordia Witebergensis*, 1536, in Hospinian's Works, vol. iv., pp. 267, 268. See Harm. Confess., p. 113 sqq.)

(19) "Inde [Wernherus Bygelius] ad ministros Tigurinos conversus, *Creditis-ne vos*, inquit, *corpus et sanguinem Christi in Cœna percipi?* CREDIMUS HOC, aiebant omnes; nam singulos ordine compellebat." (Hospinian, vol., iv., p. 284.)

"Ibi Corpus et sanguinem Domini et recipi et manducari . . . . apertissime agnoscamus." (Letter of the Swiss to Luther, 1538, in Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 285.)

(20) The following words of Bucer (concerning whose views the reader will find something in a future Paper) may be aptly compared with the language cited above (p. 295, note) from Bishop Overall—"quod *Corpus* Christi *verè* et *substantialiter* a nobis *accipiatur*, cum Sacramento utimur. *Item*, quod panis et vinum sunt signa *exhibitiva*, *quibus datis et acceptis* simul *detur* et *accipiatur* Corpus Christi." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, 1535, in Works, vol. iv., p. 231. Geneva: 1581.)

While marking the similarity of Overall's language, the reader may also observe with what careful accuracy Overall has added "in recto usu sacramenti, digneque recipientibus." See also Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 126. P. S. Edit.

The following is also from Bucer, "Si quis vellet per 'adesse Dominum realiter et substantialiter,' intelligere eum percipi *fide* reipsa et *substantiam* ejus, darem. Sin aliquid hujus sæculi vellet his vocibus admiscere, negarem. Reliquit enim Dominus mundum hunc. Voces 'carnaliter,' et 'naturaliter,' quoniam perceptionem sensuum innuunt, nanquam admiserim." ("Scripta Anglicana," quoted in Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. iii., p. 55, note. See Strype's Cranmer, Appendix, xlvi.)

I will conclude this note with an extract from a modern writer, not of our communion (therefore, perhaps, less open to the charge of prejudice), but very competent to express an opinion on the subject he is writing on:—"It is remarkable, . . . that what may be styled the *high* sacramental doctrine, is not put forward with any special prominence in the teachings of this Church [the Church of England], as compared with the view held by the Reformed Church generally in the sixteenth century. . . . .

Though only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, as distinguished from a mere corporeal Eating, still 'the body of Christ is *given, taken* and Eaten in the Supper.' *Art.* xxviii. . . . . Undoubtedly the doctrine of the *real presence* of Christ *by the Spirit*, in the Holy Eucharist, is plainly taught by the English Church; and it is only strange that any question should ever be made with regard to the point, in the Church itself. But it is no less certain, that it has no claim to be considered a distinctively Episcopal doctrine, so far at least as the past history of the Reformed Church is concerned, in any sense. Among all the early Reformed Confessions, there is hardly one in which it is not even more distinctly affirmed than it is in the Thirty-nine Articles. The Confession of the Reformed Dutch Church, in particular, is decidedly more high-toned here than the formulary of the Church of England; and we may say as much also even of the Westminster Confession itself." ("The Mystical Presence, a vindication of the Reformed or Calvinistic Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, by the Rev. J. W. Newin, D.D.," p. 98. Philadelphia, 1846.)

Note G., p. 352.

"We do *not* hold that we barely receive the *effects and benefits* of Christ's body; but we hold it *really present*, in as much as it is *really received*, and we actually *put in possession* of it though *locally absent* from us. So that while we spiritually eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood, we through faith, in a mysterious and ineffable manner, dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we are one with Christ and Christ with us; and by virtue of this spiritual and mystical yet real participation, we receive the benefits consequent to it; even the remission of our sins and all other benefits of Christ's Passion. This, *in short, is our meaning*: and *to this effect all true Church of England men declare it.*" (Dean Aldrich: quoted in Goode, on Eucharist, i., p. 40.)

"It is the communion of the body and blood of Christ. Which expresses *communication* on the part of the donor, and *participation* on the side of the receiver. There is communication from God, and a participation by us, of Christ's *crucified* body directly, and of the body *glorified* consequentially. Yet this *grant* and this *reception* of our Lord's body are not to be understood with utmost rigour, but after the manner of *symbolical* grants and conveyances; where the *symbols* are construed to be in *real* and *beneficial* effect, what they supply the place of." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 579.)

"The wax that is affixed to . . . . letters patent, howsoever for substance it be the very same with that which is to be found everywhere, yet, being applied to this use, is of more worth to the patentee, than all the wax in the country beside: so standeth it with the outward elements in the matter of the sacrament . . . . now they differ as much from common bread and wine, as heaven from earth. Neither are they to be accounted barely significative, but truly exhibitive also, of those heavenly things whereto they have relation: as being appointed by God to be a means of conveying the same unto us, and putting us in *actual* POSSESSION thereof. So that in the use of this holy ordinance, as verily as a man with his bodily hand and mouth receiveth the earthly creatures; *so verily doth he* with his spiritual hand and mouth, if any such he have, *receive the* BODY AND BLOOD *of Christ.*" (Archbishop Ussher's Sermon before Parliament, 1620. Works, vol. ii., p. 429.)

"A father makes his last will, and by it bequeaths his estate, and all the profits of it to his child. He delivers it into the hands of his son, and bids him take there his house and lands, which by this his last will he delivers to him. The son in this case receives nothing but a roll of parchment, with a seal tied to it from his father; but yet by virtue of this parchment he is entitled to his estate, performing the conditions of his will, and to all the benefits and advantages of it: and in that deed he truly and effectually received the very house and lands that were thereby conveyed to him. Our Saviour Christ, in like manner, being now about to leave the world, gives this holy sacrament, as His final bequest to us; in it he conveys to us a right to His body and blood, and to all His spiritual blessings and graces that proceed from them. So that as often as we receive this holy Eucharist, as we ought to do, we receive indeed nothing but a little bread and wine into our hands; but by the blessing and promise of Christ, we, by that bread and wine, *as really and truly become* PARTAKERS OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD, as the son by the will of his father was made inheritor of his estate: nor is it *any more necessary* for this, that Christ's *body should come down* from heaven, or the outward elements which we receive, be substantially turned into it, than it is necessary in that other case, that the very house and lands should be given into the hands of the son to make a real delivery or conveyance of them; or the will of the father be truly and properly changed into the very nature and substance of them." (Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's Preservative; vol. x., pp. 85, 86.)

Compare the following from Dean Brevint:—"It is such an ordinary kind of figure, as all men commonly love to use in their most ordinary and clearest expressions. Thus, if a father will part his estate amongst his children, delivering into their hands the titles or deeds of what he gives, he says, 'My son, here is the land which my father left me; and this the house which I bought since,' etc. This way of speaking is both so plain, and so usual in all languages and countries, that it can drive none but distracted men to miracles and transubstantiation, for fear of any such figure." (Brevint's "Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass," p. 214; Edit. Oxford, 1673.)

And this from Archbishop Tillotson:—"Nothing is more common in all languages than to give the name of the thing signified to the sign, as the delivery of a deed or writing under hand and seal is

called a conveyance or making over of such an estate: and it is really so—not the delivery of mere wax and parchment . . . as truly and really to all effects and purposes of law, as if the very material houses and lands themselves could be and were actually delivered into my hands. In like manner . . . . by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we are said to communicate or to be made partakers of the body of Christ which was broken, and of His blood which was shed for us; that is, of the real benefits of His death and passion." (Archbishop Tillotson's Works, vol. i. p. 300; Edit. 1710.)

Hutchinson says:—"Thy house and garden be not locally, not really, nor corporally, in thy lease: but effectually and sufficiently for thy profit and commodity. So Christ's body and blood be in bread and wine. This is no new similitude of mine own head: it is the similitude of Gregory Nazianzen . . . . St. Austin, also, ... calleth them *sacrosancta signacula*." (Hutchinson's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 252.)

The following is from the work of Bertram which led Ridley to the true view of the Eucharist. "We know that it is only in *some particular manner* the body of Christ; which manner is *figurative*, and in the way of *an image;* so that the verity is the thing itself. In the prayers used after the mystery of Christ's body and blood, to which the people say, *Amen;* the Priest speaks thus, 'we who have now received the *pledge* of eternal life, most humbly beseech thee to grant, that we may be manifestly made partakers of that which here we receive *under an image or sacrament.*' A *pledge and image* are the pledge and image of somewhat else; that is, they do not respect themselves, but another thing. It is *the pledge* of that thing for which it is given, *the image* of the thing it represents. They *signify* the things of which they are the pledge or image, but are not the very thing itself." (Bertram or Rathram "Concerning the body and blood of Jesus," pp. 199, 200. Edit. Dublin, 1753.)

Note H., p. 353.

The Rubric for the Communion of the Sick says,—

"If a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the curate, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood, the curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed His blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving Him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacraments with his mouth."

"In the Anglican Sarum and York *Pre-Reformation* Manuals, there was the peculiarity, as compared with the continental, of an exceptional proviso, somewhat similar to the above *primâ facie*. When in danger of vomiting the patient was told, '*Tantum Crede, et Manducasti.*' But . . . . . the *faith* required was totally different, being faith, not in Jesus Christ personally, but in the fact of the consecrated elements being by transubstantiation truly Christ." (E. B. Elliott's Reply to the Charge of the late Bishop of Salisbury, p. 30. On the subject of this teaching in the Sarum Manual; see Pusey, "Real Presence theDoctrine of the English Church," pp. 225—227; and Goode on Eucharist, vol. ii., p. 621.)

[Mr. Elliott's interpretation is supported by the context immediately preceding. The entire passage is as follows:—"*Postea interroget cum Sacerdos si recognoscat corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi sic dicendo.* Frater, credis quod sacramentum quod tractatur in altare sub forma panis, est verum corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi? *Respondeat infirmus.* Credo. *Deinde communicetur infirmus nisi prius communicatus fuerit: et nisi de vomitu vel alia irreverentia probabiliter timeatur: in quo casu dicat sacerdos infirmo.* Frater, in hoc casu sufficit tibi vera fides, et bona voluntas: tantum crede, et manducasti." (In Maskell's "Monumenta Ritualia," vol. i., pp. 88, 89.)

The difference of the teaching of our present rubric is sufficiently striking. But I suppose it will hardly be maintained that the "*vera fides*" here spoken of must needs have relation to this particular *alone*.

It is observable, however, that Bishop Cosin understands the words of St. Augustine here used—"Crede tantum et manducasti"—and so often applied by our Reformers in support of the doctrine which our present rubric teaches, as having reference to the same *particular* of doctrine. His words are—"The faith whereby we are said to eat the flesh of Christ is not that only whereby we believe that He died for our sins, (for this faith is required and supposed to precede the sacramental manducation,) but more properly that whereby we believe those words of Christ, 'This is my body,'—which was St. Austin's meaning when he said, 'Why dost thou prepare thy stomach and thy teeth? Believe, and thou hast eaten.'" (History of Transubstantiation, ch. iii., § 3; Works, Edit. Oxford, vol. iv., p. 171.) Our Reformers understood St. Augustin's words differently; and *their* sense of them they considered to be clearly supported by other teaching of St. Augustin. (See, *e.g.*, Cranmer on Lord's Supper, pp. 118, 115, 208, 212, 232; Jewel, Harding, Thess, etc., pp. 776, 1119; Sermon and Harding, p. 468; Apol. and Defence, p. 486; etc., etc.)]

Very many passages from the writings of the Reformers might be quoted, which teach in like manner (the "Crede and Manducasti" of St. Augustine) that we receive, and eat and drink Christ's body and blood whensoever (with or without the receipt of the sacramental signs) we believe with living faith that Christ's body was crucified and His blood was shed for us.

Thus, in his earlier writings, even Luther himself taught—"Carnem Filii Dei manducare, et sanguinem bibere, nihil aliud est, quam ut credam, carnem ipsius pro me datam, et sanguinem pro me effusum esse; et ideo spiritualem hanc manducationem esse oportet." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, Part II., in Works, vol. iv., p. 12; Geneva, 1681,)

Thus Tyndale:—

"God sent His Son into this world that we might live through Him. Who liveth by Him? They that eat His flesh and drink His blood. Who eat His flesh and drink His blood? They that *believe His body crucified and His blood shed* FOR THEIR SINS." (Answer to More, etc. P. S. Edit., p. 224.)

Again:—"Here it is to be noted diligently, that Christ meaneth, as every man may see, by the *eating of this bread*, none other thing

than the *belief in Himself offered up for our sins*, which faith only justifieth us." (Ibid, p. 226.)

Again:—Thus we there have Christ present, in the inward eye and sight of our faith. We *eat His body and drink* His blood; *that is*, we *believe* surely that *His body was crucified for our sins*, and *His blood shed for our salvation*." (Ibid, p. 236.)

Again (interpreting the words of our Lord):—" My flesh profiteth you nothing to eat it; but to believe that it shall be crucified and suffer for the redemption of the world, it profiteth. And when ye *thus believe*, then eat ye my flesh and drink my blood; that is, ye believe in me, to suffer for your sins." (Ibid, 239.)

Thus Cranmer:—" The true *eating and drinking* of the said *body and blood* of *Christ* is, with a constant and lively faith to *believe*, that Christ gave His body, and shed His blood upon the cross for us." (On the Lord's Supper, p. 43.)

" These things . . . . are sufficient to prove, that the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of His blood . . . . is a figurative speech, spiritually to be understand, that we must deeply print and fruitfully believe in our hearts, that His flesh was crucified and His blood shed for our redemption. And *this our belief* in Him *is to eat His flesh and drink His blood*, although they be not present here with us." (Ibid, p. 115.)

Again he affirms that St. Augustin saith, " That to eat Christ's flesh, and to drink His blood, is a figurative speech, signifying the participation of His passion, and the delectable remembrance, to our benefit and profit, that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us." (Ibid, p. 212.)

Again defending his position against Gardiner, he says:—

" I say not that in the Lord's Supper is but a figure, or that Christ is eaten only figuratively . . . . . And where you understand the invisible mystery, which St. Augustine speaketh of to be *the diversity of the body of Christ*, seen or not seen, you be far deceived . . . . But to *eat Christ's flesh*, saith St. Augustine, is *fruitfully to remember* that the same *flesh was crucified for* us. And this is spiritually to *eat His flesh and drink His blood*." (Ibid, p. 232.)

So Ridley:—" Neither is the same [flesh] received in the Supper only, but also at other times, by hearing the Gospel, and *by faith*." (Works, p. 222.)

And again :—" You do allege . . . . . inferring hereupon that Christ never gave the same His flesh to be eaten, but only in the Eucharist : I deny your minor : for He gave it both in the Eucharist to be eaten, and also otherwise, as well *in the word*, as also upon the cross." (Ibid, p. 234.)

So Latimer :—

" Whosoever *believeth* in Christ, putteth his hope, trust, and confidence in Him, *he eateth and drinketh* Him, for the spiritual eating is the right eating to everlasting life." (Sermons, 458, 459.)

So Hooper :—

" We must therefore lift up our minds into heaven, when we feel ourselves oppressed with the burden of sin, and there by *faith apprehend* and *receive* the body of Christ slain and killed, and his precious blood shed, *for our offences* ; and so, by *faith*, apply the virtue, efficacy, and strength of the merits of Christ to our souls, and by that means quit ourselves from the danger, damnation, and curse of God. And *thus to be partaker* of the worthiness and deservings of Christ's passion, *is to eat the body and drink the blood.*" (Early Writings, p. 530.)

So Hutchinson :—

" To *eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood*, is to *believe* that the Son of God, concerning His humanity and flesh, was *nailed on the cross*, and that *His blood was let forth* for the expiation of *our sins*, and for our redemption and righteousness . . . . God's holy word knoweth no other receipt of Christ's very body and natural flesh, neither in the Sacrament nor without it." (Works, pp. 262, 263.)

So Coverdale :—

" Then *eat we His flesh, and then drink we His blood*, when we through *true belief*, do ponder and *consider* what He hath done and *suffered for our sakes.*" (Fruitful Lessons, P. S. Edit., p. 212.)

So Jewel, who had before (Apology and Defence, p. 487,) quoted from St. Augustine the same passage, the true meaning of which Cranmer was defending, says,—

" Christ . . . . meant not the receiving of the Sacrament, but the spiritual *eating of His very body*, and the spiritual *drinking of His very blood;* whereof he is made partaker unto resurrection and life everlasting, *whosoever believeth in the death of Christ.*" (Apology and Defence, p. 532.)

So Becon;—

"What is it to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ? It is to believe that Christ suffered His passion for our sins." (Prayers, etc., p. 612.)

So Sandys:—

"Spiritually by faith we *feed upon Christ*, when we stedfastly *believe that His body was broken, and His blood shed for* us, upon the cross." (Sermons, p. 89.)

To prevent misunderstanding it may be well perhaps to admonish the reader, that he would do very wrong to gather from these extracts that our Reformers thought that it was a matter of indifference to receive or not receive the outward and visible signs. They did *not* hold that Christ's ordinance might be neglected by Christians. They *did* hold and teach the general necessity of the Sacrament unto salvation.

Note I., p. 356.

Thus it is said by Bertram:—"In this sacrifice, there is a thanksgiving, and commemoration of that flesh of Christ, which he offered for us, and of that blood, which the same [Christ] our God, hath shed for us." (Bertram or Rathram "Concerning the body and blood of Jesus," p. 204. Edit. Dublin, 1753.) Again, "The bread and cup, which is called, and is the body and blood of Christ, represents the memory of the Lord's passion or death . . . is set there for a figure, or in remembrance of the Lord's death." (Ibid, p. 211.)

[Compare the following:—

"Fractio hostiæ imaginem refert corporis Christi confracti et suppliciis lacerati, ut veteres omnes agnoscunt." (Renaudot: Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio: Tom. i., Dessertatio, p. xx. Frankfort, 1847.)

"Dum enim, sicut ait Prosper, frangitur hostia et sanguis in ora fidelium infunditur, immolatio corporis Christi in cruce, et effusio sanguinis ejus de latere designatur." (Durandus, Rationale Div: Offic: p. 302. Naples, 1859.)]

So Cranmer :—" By whose passion we are filled at his table, and whose blood, we, receiving out of his holy side, do live for ever . . . being no less assured and certified, that we are fed spiritually unto eternal life by Christ's flesh crucified, and by his blood shed, the true food of our minds, than our bodies be fed with meat and drink in this life." (Cranmer in Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., p. 448.)

" As though he [Christ] should say ' . . . Consider and behold my body crucified for you : *that* eat and digest in your minds ; chew you upon my *passion*, be fed with my *death*. This is the true meat." (Ibid, p. 448.)

And so Bradford : " I have told you that it is not simply bread and wine, but rather Christ's body, so called of Christ, and so to be called and esteemed of us. But here let us mark what body and what blood Christ called it. The papists still babble ' This ', ' this is my body, this is my blood ;' but what body it is, what blood it is they shew not. Look therefore . . . on Christ's own words ; and you shall see that Christ calleth it ' his body broken ' and his blood shed . . . so that in the celebration of the Lord's Supper the *very passion* of Christ should be *as present*, beholden with the eyes o faith." (Bradford, Sermons, Meditations, etc. P. S. Edit. p. 102.)

See Nowell's Catechism : " M. Then I perceive the Holy Suppe *sendeth us* TO THE DEATH OF CHRIST, and to His sacrifice *once don upon the Cross*, by which alone God is appeased towards us. S. I is most true. For by bread and wine, the signs, is assured unto u that as the body of Christ was once offered a sacrifice for us to r concile us to favour with God, and His blood once shed, to wash awa the spots of our sins, so now also in His Holy Supper BOTH AR GIVEN TO THE FAITHFUL, that we *surely know that the reconciliation favour* pertaineth to us, and may *take and receive* the fruit of t redemption purchased by His death." (P.S. Edit., p. 215.)

And so Hooker :—

" The very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security th these mysteries do as nails fasten us to His very Cross, that by the we draw out, as touching EFFICACY, FORCE, AND VIRTUE, even the BLO OF HIS GORED SIDE ; in the wounds of our Redeemer we there d our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, OUR HUNGER SATISFIED, and our THIRST *for ever* QUENCHED." (Hooker, Keble, Ed vol. ii., p. 361.)

So Bishop Andrewes, "We are also carried back to Christ, as He was at the very instant, and in the very act *of His* offering. So, and no otherwise, doth this text teach; so, and no otherwise, do we represent Him." Upon which passage Archbishop Wake has written, "Whatever Real Presence this bishop believed, it must be of His crucified body, and as in the state of his death; and that I think cannot be otherwise *present* than in one of those two ways mentioned above by Archbishop Cranmer, and both of which we willingly acknowledge; either figuratively in the elements, or spiritually in *the souls of those who worthily receive them.*" (See Archbishop Wake, "Discourse of the Holy Eucharist" in Gibson's Preservative. Vol. x., p. 69, 70.)

So Dr. Barlow:—

"Great difference there is (perchance not observed by many) between our *eating* of Christ, and our *uniting* with Him.

"1. We *eat* Him as our Passover; that as the Israelites ate the one *mortuum et assum, dead and roasted*, so we Him *crucifixum et passum, dead and slain.* And so that speech of St. Austin is true, we have Him here in *pabulo* as He was *in patibulo*, torn and rent: as Himself ordained the Sacrament *in pane fracto* not *integro*, the *bread broken*, not the *whole loaf*; thereby signifying, yea saying, that in doing it we must remember Him, not as *living* among us, but as *dying* for us: *ut in cruce, non in cœlo*, as He was *crucified*, not as He is *glorified.* Whereby we conclude, first, for His *presence*, that His body is so far forth there *quatenus editur*, as it is *eaten;* but His body is *eaten* as *dead and slain;* so Himself appointed it, *This is my body*, and stayeth not there, but adds withal, *which is given for you*, And His blood is drunk, not as *remaining in His veins*, but as *shed;* so Himself speaketh, *This is my blood of the New Testament* shed *for many.* Now, His body bruised, and His blood *poured out*, can no otherwise be *present* in the Eucharist, but by a *representation* thereof in the bread *broken*, and in the wine *effused*, of the one side; and on the communicant's part, by a grateful *recordation* of the benefits, a reverent *valuation* of the sacrifice, a faithful *application* of His merits in His whole passion: and therefore His *presence* must be *sacramental*, and our eating spiritual; for *non quod videtur, sed quod creditur, pascit*, saith St. Austin. 2. For the *union*, we are united to Him *ut viventi*, as our *living* head, *et nos vivificanti*, and

making us His lively members." (Dr. Barlow, quoted in Waterland, iv., pp. 603, 604.)

So Bishop Lake :—

"This will not only secure our souls, but settle our judgments against the sophistry of the Church of Rome, who *not distinguishing between Christ crucified and glorified*, or rather not building their conclusions answerable to this undeniable principle, THE SACRAMENTS REPRESENT CHRIST CRUCIFIED NOT GLORIFIED, are driven to coin so many new Articles. 1. Of *Real Presence Corporal*. 2. Of a metaphysical transubstantiation. 3. Of an ill-applied concomitancy. All which *easily vanish*, if we consider Christ's *purpose to represent Himself* in the Sacrament, not as HE NOW IS AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD, BUT AS HE WAS UPON THE CROSS. Not but it is the *same* body and blood which is in glory, but it must not be considered as it is in glory." (Bishop Lake, Sermons, Part ii., p. 170. 1629.)

Bishop Hall says of the words "This is my body which is given for you"—"This was the body which was given for them, betrayed, crucified, humbled to the death; not the glorious body of Christ, which should be capable of ten thousand places at once, both in heaven and earth; invisible, incircumscriptable." (Works, vol. ix., p. 253. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

So Bishop Reynolds :—

"It hath pleased our good God . . . . to exhibit with his own hands (for, what is done by his officers is by him done) that sacred body, with the efficacy of it, unto us . . . . that we might, at this spiritual altar, see Christ (as it were) crucified before our eyes, cling unto his cross, and grasp it in our arms, suck in his blood, and with salvation . . . that being all over died with his blood, we may use boldness." (Works, vol. iii., pp. 83, 84. Edit. 1826.)

So Bishop Patrick, "How doth He communicate to us His Incarnation, but by giving us the fruits and benefits of it? And so He communicates to us His *broken* body, and His blood that was *shed*. We partake of both in the same manner, ... By means of this Sacrament we are INVESTED IN the MERIT *of them*. For it is NOT *merely* His body and blood, but His body *broken* and blood *shed* (as I said just now,) which we are made partakers of. And that is as much as to say, we are partakers of His death." (Christian Sacrifice, Part ii., § vi., p. 54. Edit., 1690.)

So Brevint:—

"Jesus living in Galilee . . . could not have been the bread of life: it must be Jesus *suffering*, Jesus *crucified*, Jesus *dying*." (Brevint's Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, p. 24. Edit. Oxford, 1673.)

So Dr. Waterland writes:—

"The Eucharist, in its primary intention, and in its certain effect to all worthy communicants, is a communion of Christ's body broken and blood shed, that is to say, a present partaking of, or having a part in our Lord's Passion, and the reconcilement therein made, and the blessed fruits of it. This is plain good sense, and undeniable truth. 'The body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed received of the faithful: that is, they have a real part and portion given them in the death and sufferings of the Lord Jesus, whose body was broken and blood shed for the remission of sins. They truly and indeed partake of the virtue of His bloody sacrifice, whereby He hath obtained eternal redemption for us.' (Patrick.) It is observable, that St. Paul, (his own best interpreter,) instead of saying, Ye do shew the Lord's body and blood, broken and shed, says, 'Ye do shew the Lord's death till He come.' Which makes it plain, that *body broken and blood shed* are, in this case, equivalent to the single word *death* with its *fruits;* and that is the *thing signified* in our sacramental service. And if that be the thing signified, it is that which we partake of, or spiritually receive: and we are in this Sacrament ingrafted, as it were, into the death of Christ, in much the same sense, and to the same effect, as in the other sacrament we are said to be baptized into His death, and planted together in the likeness of His death. All the difference is, that the same thing is represented and exhibited, here and there, under different signs or symbols. There we have our right and title to the merits and benefits of His passion, delivered to us under the symbol of water enclosing us, as a grave encloses a dead body; here we have the same right and title again delivered under the symbols of bread and wine, received by us, and incorporated with us." (Waterland, Works, vol. iv., pp. 620, 621.)

And again—

"We say, upon our principles, that the distinct mentioning both of the body and the blood was exceeding proper, and very significant; because it shews that our Lord is considered in the Eucharist ac-

cording to the state He was in at His crucifixion: for then only it was, that His body and blood were separate; one hanging on the Cross, the other spilled upon the ground. That body and that blood are commemorated in the Eucharist, the body broken and the blood shed; therefore, St. Paul so distinctly mentioned both, lest Christians should think (as indeed, in late and dark ages, Christians have thought,) that the words of the institution, though express for broken body, and blood shed upon earth, should be interpreted to mean His glorified body in heaven. St. Paul very justly followed the style of the institution, our Lord's own style: and by that he shewed, that he was speaking of the separation of the body and blood, which in reality was the death of our Lord, or seen only in His death, and consequently such manner of speaking directly pointed to the death of our Lord, and to the fruits or benefits arising from it." (Waterland, Works; vol. iv., pp. 636, 637.)

Mr. S. C. Malan, writes:—

"We, therefore, require no special rite to remind us of Him who is present, and who, if we live with Him as we ought, is 'the Friend who sticketh closer than a brother;' not once only but always. But we do require something to remind us of His death and sacrifice; and some special act, rite, or ceremony to be done εἰς ἀνάμνησιν for the purpose of helping our minds and hearts to turn back to that one oblation, which could only be wrought once, and which was then once offered for ever. As regards, then, the intention and performance of the holy rite itself, it has regard *to that sacrifice* ONLY. . . . . The Sacrament was instituted in remembrance of Him AS HE WAS *at the time of His death and passion* ONLY; says, S. Chrysostom." (Malan's Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Nutt, p. 93. See Bishop Parry's True Passover, pp. 67, 68, and 36, 37.)

"The body and blood are exhibited by the bread and wine in a state of separation from one another. Now the blood is in Scripture said to be the Life; and accordingly the separation of the blood from the body indicates that death has taken place. It is, then, with a dying Christ, and so with an atoning and propitiating Christ, that the Holy Supper, duly received, makes us one." (Goulburn on Office of Holy Communion, p. 307.)

Note K., p. 359.

Dean Goode has excellently said, "When our Church denied the corporal presence, the presence of the real body and blood, it indirectly maintained, in so doing, the figurative sense of the words *eating* and *drinking*, because it *is* of the *true real material body and blood of Christ* that we are to eat and drink." And again:—"The real material body and blood of Christ may be made present to the *spirit* of man, as the sun is present when seen and felt, and be spiritually fed upon through faith. And as to any marcionite phantasm of the body and blood of Christ, such as our authors imagine, *this is not what the believer wants.* His faith wants the reality to feed upon; the true material body and blood; the body that was broken and the blood that was shed upon the cross." (On Eucharist, vol. i., pp. 53, 54.)

Let the reader be asked to study, in this connexion, the two following extracts from Bertramn.

"How warily, and wisely doth he [St. Ambrose] distinguish; speaking of the flesh of Christ, which was crucified and buried, or in which Christ was crucified and buried, he saith, It is the true flesh of Christ: But of that which is taken in the sacrament he saith, It's therefore truly the sacrament of his flesh, distinguishing between the sacrament of his flesh, and the verity of his flesh, [or his true flesh] inasmuch as he saith, in that true flesh which he took of the Virgin, he was crucified and buried; whereas he saith, the mystery celebrated in the Church, is the sacrament of that true flesh in which he was crucified: expressly teaching the faithful, that that flesh in which Christ was crucified and buried, is not a mystery, but true and natural; whereas that flesh which mystically represents the former, is not flesh in kind, or naturally, but sacramentally." (Bertram or Rathram "Concerning the Body and Blood of Jesus," pp. 181, 182. Edit. Dublin, 1753.)

"It . . . confers eternal life and incorruption, if we attend not to that which feeds the body, which is chewed with our teeth, and ground to pieces, but to that which is spiritually received by faith." (Ibid, p. 202.)

"That flesh which was crucified, was made of the virgin's flesh,

consisting of bones and nerves. . . . Moreover the flesh of Christ, which was crucified, did not outwardly appear any other thing, than what inwardly it was. For it was the true flesh of a true man; a true body in the shape of a true body." (Ibid, pp. 190, 191.)

"That which our bodily sense perceives is corruptible; that which faith believes, is incorruptible. Wherefore that which outwardly appears, is not the thing itself, but the image of it; but that which the mind perceives and understands, is the very thing itself." (Ibid, p. 194. See also the passages quoted in pp. 410 and 415.)

[No doubt there are passages in Bertram's work which require a favourable construction,—some, which in his *figurative* language, might appear to speak of another *not real* body. But other passages seem to me to give the key to their true interpretation. (See especially pp. 143, 145, 147, 180, 191, 197, 204, 205.) And the reader who has marked the force of his teaching in the extracts given above, will scarcely, I think, so much wonder that a Romish Divine should have believed the book to be written by Œcolampadius in Bertramn's name. (See L'Aroque, "History of Eucharist," Walker's Translation, 1684, p. 406, sqq., and Mosheim's Eccl. History. vol. ii., p. 199. See also p. 220. Edit. Soames) as that Bertramn should now be claimed as a teacher (to our Reformers) of the Real Objective Presence. (See Pusey's "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 205, sqq.) If Bertram believed a Real Objective Presence to be in the bread and wine, he believed the same to have been in the manna and the rock, (pp. 160 and 162.) Nay, it seems to me quite clear that he teaches that *the faithful people* are present in the elements with the *very same presence* as the body of Christ (pp. 191, 192, 210,) *i.e.* in *a mystery*, or in *a figure*. To the Dublin Edition is prefixed a Dissertation which ably vindicates Bertramn from misrepresentation. (See pp. 74—139, and especially pp. 84 100, 103, 106.)]

Let the reader also be asked to note well what Jewel says;—"Christ . . . . meant . . . . . the *spiritual eating* of His VERY BODY, and the *spiritual drinking* of His VERY BLOOD; whereof *he* is *made partaker* unto resurrection and life everlasting whosoever believeth in the death of Christ." (Apology and Defence p. 532.) And to the same effect Beza:—"Certainly it would be too absurd to interpret the names of the body and blood of the

fruit and efficacy of the death of the Lord, or to restrain them to the spiritual object thereof alone. To make this perfectly plain, let us substitute that interpretation for these words, 'body' and 'blood,' and say, 'This is the efficacy of my death, which is given for you; and this is my Spirit, which is poured out for you. What more senseless than such a mode of speaking? For certainly those words 'which is given for you,' of necessity constrain men to understand it *of the very substance* of the body and blood of Christ." (Quoted in Dr. Pusey's Sermon, "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," p. 32. See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., pp. 59 sqq.)

So Cranmer:—

"And to express it yet more plainly than peradventure you would have me, I say, that the SAME VISIBLE AND PALPABLE FLESH that was for us *crucified, and appeared* after His resurrection, and was *seen, felt,* and *groped,* and *ascended* into heaven, and there *sitteth* at His Father's right hand, and at the last day shall come to judge the quick and the dead; THAT SELF SAME BODY, *having all the parts of a man's body,* in good order and proportion, and being visible and tangible, I say, is eaten of christian people at His Holy Supper. What will you now require more of me concerning the truth of the body? I suppose you be sorry that I grant you so much, and yet what doth this help you? For THE DIVERSITY IS NOT IN THE BODY, but in THE EATING thereof, *no man eating it carnally;* but the good eating it both sacramentally and spiritually, and the evil only sacramentally, that is to say, figuratively." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 224.)

And again:—

"And yet here is to be noted by the way, that you say we receive not in the Sacrament Christ's flesh that was crucified; which your words seem to agree evil with Christ's words, who, the night before He was crucified, declared to His disciples, that He gave them the same body that should suffer death for them. And the apostles received the body of Christ, yet passible and mortal, which the next day was crucified; and if we receive not in the Sacrament the body that was crucified, then receive we not the same body that the apostles did." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 234.)

Compare the following:—

"*Weston.* 'The same flesh whereby Christ is made our brother and

kinsman, is given of Christ to us to be eaten. Christ is made our brother and kinsman by His true, natural, and organical flesh. Ergo, His true, natural, organical flesh is given to us to be eaten.'

"*Cranmer.* '*I* GRANT *the consequence and the consequent.*'" (Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., p. 451.)

[It must not be said that there is any inconsistency between such sayings of Cranmer, and his declaration (in Preface to Edit. 1551) that when he speaks of the presence of the body he means the real and effectual presence of "the grace, the virtue and benefit" of Christ's body crucified and blood shed. On the contrary, in the harmony of such statements is evidence of Cranmer's true view (and the same may be said of our other Reformers) of the inseparable connexion between the *real presence* of the benefits and the *real giving and receiving* of the crucified body itself—not present save to the eye of faith.]

So Archbishop Ussher:—

"We willingly indeed do acknowledge, that that which is inwardly presented in the Lord's Supper, and spiritually received by the soul of the faithful, is THAT VERY THING which is treated of in the sixth of John; but we deny that it was our Saviour's intention in this place to speak of that which is externally delivered in the Sacrament and orally received by the communicant." (Archbishop Ussher's Answer to Jesuits' Challenge; in Works; vol. iii., p. 54. See Bishop Parry's True Passover, pp. 64, 65.)

Note L, p. 361.

See Archbishop Sharp, as quoted in Waterland's Works, vol. iv., p. 569. "The *body* and *blood* of Christ are to be understood in such a sense as a *soul* can be supposed to feed upon a *body*, or to receive strength and nourishment by *feeding* upon it. But now the body of Christ CAN BE *no otherwise* as *food* for the strengthening and refreshing our souls, than only as the *spiritual benefits* of that body and blood, that is to say, *the virtue and effects of Christ's sacrifice* upon

the Cross, are communicated to it; nor is the soul capable of receiving those benefits otherwise than by *faith*."

So Ridley:—"This virtue and grace Chrysostom, after the phrase and manner of John the Evangelist, calleth Christ's flesh." (Works, p. 224.)

So Jewel writes, "St. Augustine saith: *Laverunt stolas suas in sanguine Agni, ... hoc est, in gratia Dei . . . . per Christum:* 'They have washed their coats in the blood of the Lamb, that is to say, in the grace of God through Christ.' This grace flowing from Christ's body upon the Cross, and given to the faithful in the ministration of the holy mysteries, oftentimes *beareth the name of Christ's body*, and is the ground and substance of the Sacrament; and whosoever is *partaker of this grace* is also *partaker of Christ's body*." (Apol. and Defence, p. 487.)

So Bishop Morton:—

"The TRUTH of a thing consisteth *especially* in the EFFECTUAL VIRTUE which it hath. . . . . Vain is that vulgar conceit of some, who ask how can a man eat the body of Christ spiritually? when as indeed they should rather demand, how shall a man eat the body of Christ *truly* (according to the principal truth wherein we are commanded to eat it,) except it be spiritually?" (Morton's Catholic Appeal. Lib. ii., cap. 2, sect. 26, pp. 117, 128.)

Compare the following from Dean Jackson:—"Unless He grant some *real influence* of His Spirit . . . . we do *not* REALLY receive His body and blood with the elements of bread and wine; we do not so receive them as to have our sins remitted or dissolved by them; we do not by receiving them become of His flesh and of His bones; we gain no degree of real union with Him; which is the sole *use or fruit* of His *real presence*. Christ *might be* LOCALLY *present*, as He was with many here on earth, and yet *not* REALLY *present*. But with whomsoever He is virtually present—that is, to whomsoever He communicates the *influence* of His body and blood by His Spirit—He is REALLY *present* with them, though LOCALLY *absent* from them." (Dean Jackson's Works, vol. ix., p. 611; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

And add the following:—"The implication contained in the connexion between these two verses [John vi. 62, 63] and the precedent is this—That Christ's virtual presence, or the influence of life, which His human nature was to distil from His heavenly throne, should be

more profitable to such as were capable of it, than His bodily presence, than the bodily eating of His flesh and blood could be, although it had been convertible into their bodily substance. This distillation of life and immortality from His glorified human nature, is that which the ancient and orthodoxal Church did mean in their figurative and lofty speeches of Christ's real presence, or of eating His very flesh and drinking His very blood in the Sacrament." (Ibid, vol. x., p. 41; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

And the following:—"If, by the mere virtual presence of Christ's body and blood, the men which have been long dead shall be restored to perfect life and immortality, shall not the souls of all which receive Him in the Sacrament by faith and true repentance be raised to newness of life by the same virtual presence, without any *local touch* of His body, but only by that sweet influence which daily issueth from this Sun of righteousness, now placed at the right hand of God as in its proper sphere. This manner of Christ's presence, of His real presence in the Sacrament—to wit, by *powerful influence from His humanity*—our Church did never deny." (Ibid, vol. x., p. 261; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

Dean Jackson says also:—This *present efficacy* of Christ's body and blood upon our souls, or *real communication* of both, I find as a truth unquestionable amongst the ancient fathers, and as a Catholic Confession. The modern Lutheran and the modern Romanist have fallen into their several errors concerning Christ's presence in the Sacrament, from a common ignorance; neither of them conceive, or are willing to conceive, how Christ's body and blood should have any real operation upon our souls, unless they were so *locally present*, as they might *agere per contactum;* that is, either so purge our souls by oral manducation, as physical medicines do our bodies, (which is the pretended use of transubstantiation,) or so quicken our souls, as sweet odours do our animal spirits, which were the most probable use of consubstantiation. Both the Lutherans and Papists avouch the authority of the ancient Church for their opinions, but most injuriously." (Ibid, vol. ix., p. 598; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

So Hammond: "So verily God is in Heaven, bestows on me communicates to me, the body of the crucified Saviour," . . . [above] "On His part, the making over to us *all the benefits* of

His body and blood (*i.e.* His death) grace and pardon, to sanctify nd to justify us." (Practical Catechism, p. 129. See also p. 180.)

And again :—

"What was before said in Christ's words to be His *body*, is more anifestly said, [by St. Paul] to be the *communication of* His *body*, iat is, the bestowing it upon us, (as the communication of the altar, mong the Jews or Gentiles, is their eating of the sacrifice, their ods entertaining them at that sacrificial feast,) which, I suppose, ncludes this sacrament to be, according to the nature of sacraments, holy rite, a *solemn act or instrument*, instituted by God to communiate to or confer on us *the body of Christ, that is*, the EFFICACY and ENEFITS *of Christ's* DEATH." (On Matt. xxvi. 26.)

Bishop Hall says,—"So doth our mouth and stomach receive the read and wine, as that in the meantime our souls receive the flesh nd blood of Christ: now the soul is *not capable* of receiving flesh nd blood, but by the power of that grace of *faith, which appropriates* t." (Works, vol. ix., pp. 371, 372; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

Bishop Reynolds says—"A true presence of Christ we acknowedge, but not a local or physical; for presence real (that being a etaphysical term) is not opposed unto a mere physical or local bsence or distance. . . . What presence fitter for a spiritual union han a spiritual presence? . . . It is a spiritual presence, of energy, ower, and concomitancy with the element, by which Christ doth ppoint, that *by* and *with* these mysteries, though not *in* or *from* hem, his *sacred body* should be conveyed into the faithful soul. And uch a presence of Christ *in power*, though absent in flesh, as it is nost compatible with the properties of a human body, so doth it most nake for the demonstration of his power, who can, without any ecessity of a fleshly presence, send as *great influence* from his acred body on the Church, as if he should visibly descend amongst us. Neither can any man show any enforcing reason, why, unto the eal exhibition and reception of Christ crucified, there should any nore physical presence of his be required, than there is of the sun nto the eyes for receiving his light . . . or of the land and purchase nade over by a sealed deed for receiving the lordship." (Works, ol. iii., pp. 72, 73, 74. Edit. 1826.)

So Brevint:—"Faithful communicants eat as effectually of the ody of Jesus Christ, by receiving its STRENGTH *and virtue*, as the

saints eat of the tree of life (Rev. xxii. 2) because they did eat of the *fruit* of that tree: or Israel did drink of the rock (1 Cor. x. 4) because they did drink of the stream that flowed from it. . . . The truth is we really touch, have, or enjoy, the thing itself, when we are within that distance where we may enjoy its *virtue*. . . . . Thus Christ's body and blood have everywhere, but especially at the holy communion, a most *true and real presence*. . . . Since he is gone up into heaven, thence he sends down on earth the *graces* that spring continually from his everlasting sacrifice . . . this sacred body of Jesus fills with *atonement* and *blessing* the remotest parts of this temple. (Brevint's Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, pp. 47—49.)

Compare Archbishop Sharp:—"Though his body be in heaven and not here, yet he is, by his Spirit, *really present* in and with all those who do worthily partake of his sacrament, in order to the strengthening and refreshing their souls by *his influence*, as our bodies are strengthened and refreshed by the bread and wine. And this is *all that we mean* by the *real presence* in the sacrament. (Archbishop Sharp's Works, Edit. Oxford, 1829, vol. v., p. 228.)

So Archbishop Secker:—"We acknowledge, that the bread and wine are more than a representation of his body and blood: they are the means, by which the *benefits*, arising from them, are conveyed to us; and have thence a further title to be called by their name. For so the Instrument, by which a Prince forgives an offender, is called his Pardon, because it conveys his Pardon; the delivery of a writing is called giving Possession of an Estate; and a Security for a sum of money, is called the Sum itself; and *is so in virtue and effect* though it is not in strictness of speech, and reality of substance . . . And as this is plainly the sense, in which he [Christ] says, that *his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed:* so it is the sense, in which the latter part of the third answer of our Catechism is to be understood; that *the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper*. (Lectures on the Catechism, vol. ii., pp. 249, 250. Edit. 176[illegible]. "This real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, his Church has always believed. But the monstrous notion of his bodily Presence was started 700 years after his death." (Ibid, p. 251.)

So also Waterland:—"The body and blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful, not *substantially*, not *corporally*, but

verily and *indeed*, that is, *effectually*. The sacred symbols are no bare signs, no untrue figures of a thing absent: but the *force*, the *grace*, the *virtue*, and *benefit* of Christ's *body broken, and blood shed*, that is of *his passion*, are really and effectually *present* with all them that receive worthily. This is *all the* REAL *presence our Church teaches*. . . . The *eating* his flesh and *drinking* his blood, mean having a part in that atonement, being partakers of the *benefit* of Christ's *death and satisfaction*. By *this*, and this *only*, we live; without it we die. It is by our Lord's meritorious death and passion that men are saved, as many as are saved: and, were it not for that, no flesh could be saved." (Works, vol. iv., pp. 42, 43.)

See also Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative. Vol. x., p. 58, sqq.

ERRATA.

In Paper No. II., p. 69, 7th line from top, *for* 1546 *read* 1550.
In the same Paper, p. 83, in foot-notes, *for* 1855 *read* 1555.
In Paper No. V., p. 280, note, *for* "Tigurinus" *read* "Orthodoxus, Tiguri. 1605."

PAPERS

ON THE

EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

No. VII.

THE ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

In proceeding now to the consideration of our Communion Service, let me begin by asking of my readers some allowance for the difficulties I feel, in so setting forth my own views in relation to the opinions and arguments of those who differ from me, as to do justice to my own convictions, and at the same time to do no injustice to the views, and no injury to the feelings of those who maintain the Real Objective Presence. If sometimes I shall fail to overcome these difficulties, I trust the failure will not be set down to any desire to offend.

Generals do not concentrate their forces on sandhills, nor build fortifications on mud banks, if there is a strong height within easy reach.

It argues ill for the possession of strong points and great points, when men plant their strength on what is weak and small.

Let it not seem to be said unkindly, when I say, that it cannot but strike one, as arguing forcibly against any real strength in their position, that in dealing with the service for the Holy Communion, the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence, are found to build their arguments so much upon what may fairly be called small matters, some of them mere minutiæ and grammatical niceties.

When we enter on an examination of this service, surely we are entering on that which should yield us at once, abundantly and unmistakably, the teaching of our Church's doctrines on the subject of the Eucharist.

Surely great truths, truths to be taught and held as *de fide*, should not here be left to be laboriously spun out o thin threads, the spider's webs of minute verbal and grammatical criticisms.

Those, whose views I am here opposing, must allow m to say, not at all, I trust, in anything like a spirit of triumph over what appears to me their weakness, but simply in a desire to bring the true state of the case (as it seems to me clearly and forcibly before my readers, that such an examination of the service as these criticisms rise out of, seem almost like the microscopical examination of some palimpsest manuscript, in which curious eyes desire to decipher * some characters of the older and obliterated writing, discernible yet under the plain and obvious marking of a more recent hand. Or perhaps, in some cases, it may be more like the straining of the eyes to discover whether our Reformers after ruling their lines straight, have always exactly kept to those lines: whether a very minute and searching investigation may not discover some small strokes, perhaps a little to

* See Appendix, Note A.

high, or some turns a little too low, while the broad and clear characters which meet the naked eye, are seen all following their line too plainly, and marking their sense too clearly and distinctly to admit of a question.

To aim at answering all such criticisms as these, appears to me to be giving them an undue importance.*

Nevertheless, since it is not pleasant to have shown to us, by an oxy-hydrogen microscope, black monsters in a drop of water, and then to be told that this water is what we are drinking every day, it may be worth while to take one or two examples, by which it may be seen, that as sometimes dark shadows may be cast from some fault in the lens, instead of from some terrible pollution in the liquid, so some of these microscopical revelations of what we should regard as false teaching in our Prayer Book, may be found after all to have in them nothing so very formidable.

(1) One such example,† and it appears to be thought to involve a most serious difficulty for us, is found in the first exhortation, where it is said that "God hath given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ . . . . to be our spiritual food and sustenance *in that holy Sacrament, which*, being so divine . . . . to them who receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that presume to receive *it* unworthily, etc." Here a dilemma is before us. The antecedent of "*which*," must be "holy Sacrament." We are to choose our sense of "holy Sacrament." Does its sense here include the *res Sacramenti?* If we answer "No," then we are told, that

* See Appendix, Note B.

† See Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 336 sqq.; also Grueber's Answer to Dr. Heurtley, pp. 15, 16; and Letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, 1856, pp. 17, 18, 33, 34; and Second Letter, pp. 24, 25; and Bishop Forbes on Articles, vol. ii., p. 577.

our Saviour Jesus Christ, our food and sustenance must be "in the elements." If we answer, "Yes," then we must acknowledge that some presume to receive, and do receive, the "res Sacramenti," *i. e.*, the body and blood of Christ unworthily. Choose which we will, we are to find ourselves brought to the acknowledgment, somehow, of the "Real Objective Presence."

But, is it anything very strange or unnatural to understand "that holy Sacrament" to signify the whole ordinance?* And if not, where then is there any shadow of a difficulty remaining?

(2) Another example is set before us as presenting a very serious difficulty indeed.

The difficulty is in the very words of administration. "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."

It is expressed in the following words taken from "Fragments, by Edward Husband, Priest of the Church of England."† (Palmer.) "If then the BREAD is not the BLESSED BODY. . . . . I am guilty of a FALSEHOOD every time I use those words, and knowingly DECEIVE the hearts of the Faithful by declaring It to be what It is not. . . . . But what will you say of us, the Priests of the Most High God if we at Holy Communion offer you That which we certify by our words, to be 'the body and blood' of the Lord, and all the time ourselves believe It to be nothing more or less than earthly bread and wine, to be received in remembrance of an absent Christ? Why, I think you would say, 'What hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?'

* See Appendix, Note C.

† See Appendix, Note D.

Oh! sooner far than uttering these 'words of administration' without believing in what they say, in our own souls, let us resign our position altogether, and seek some place where we should not SEAR *our conscience*, by UTTERING *with our lips* what we do NOT *believe* in our hearts!" (Pages 11, 12.)

I must profess myself unable* to see WHERE in the words alluded to, is to be found that which Mr. Husband considers must be such an insuperable difficulty to us.

But I rather think, wherever the difficulty may be supposed to lie, the argument of Mr. Husband will be sufficiently met by asking ONE *question*. What WOULD Mr. Husband have thought of our bondage, if instead of having on our souls the burden which the Church of England has laid on us, we had in its place the yoke which would have been imposed by the Westminster Assembly, who in their Directory,† appoint the minister to "break the bread and give it to the communicants," saying, "Take ye, eat ye,‡

* "For the other exceptions, there is very little in them, whether the minister lay his hand on the sacred elements when he repeats the words of institution, as at the time, or only consecrates them by the prayers of the Church and the words of Christ, without any other ceremony as heretofore: whether with the Church of Rome we use only the words of Christ in the distribution'; or with most of the Reformed Churches the other expression, 'Take, and eat this,' etc., or (as we choose rather) join them both together: whether we sing the *Gloria in Excelsis Deo* before or after the receiving." (Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 79.)

† See Appendix, Note E.

‡ So the Puritan Prayer Book of 1574 or 1575, which takes the name of Middleburgh (where a company of English merchants resided under the ministry of Cartwright, and where subsequent editions were published), directs the minister "to break the bread and deliver it to

THIS IS THE BODY OF CHRIST which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Him."*

Apply the same rule to the words of distribution, and if it might make the Church of England seem to be Lutheran, the Puritan divines might be judged to be Papists.

(3) One more example (and it is alleged as one of great force) shall be taken.

The argument is derived from the words of the Prayer of Humble Access:—"Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, *so* to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, *that* our sinful bodies," etc.

It is alleged that, as a necessary consequence of the words of this prayer, it *must* be *possible so*† to eat the flesh of Christ and to drink His blood, as that our sinful bodies may NOT be made clean by His body, nor our souls washed in His most precious blood. If so, then it must be possible to receive the *res sacramenti* unworthily. And to say that the unworthy receive the "*res sacramenti*," is to make a presence "objective" in the elements, and independent of faith in the heart.

the people, saying, Take and eat: *this bread is the body* of Christ that was broken for us." (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 195; and Hall's Fragmenta Liturgica, vol. i., pp. 9 and 65; and Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, vol. i., p. 59; also, Bancroft's "Dangerous Positions," pp. 95—97, London, 1591.) And Baxter's Service gives these for the words of administration:—"Take ye, eat ye; *this is the body* of Christ, which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of Him." (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 202; and Hall's Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, vol. iv., p. 72.)

* See Appendix, Note F.

† See Archdeacon Denison, "Three Sermons," p. 71; J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, p. 186, note; Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 345; etc.

But surely there is no real difficulty in understanding the prayer to imply *sacramental* (not *real*) eating *only* in the case of unbeneficial reception. The prayer might not unnaturally be paraphrased thus:—* "Grant us to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son, not sacramentally only, receiving in our mouths the shadow and sign alone, to our condemnation, but so really and in very truth, receiving by our faith and feeding in our hearts upon the very Thing signified,"† etc.

In order, however, completely to invalidate all the force of this argument, it will be sufficient, I think, to call attention to the fact, that the separation in a sentence of "*so*" from "THAT" does *by no means* OF NECESSITY, in the language of our Prayer Book (as is commonly the case in modern use), put that emphasis on the "*so*" which implies that the same thing *might be*, with different results.

For proof of this, let the reader be asked to mark carefully the use of the same form of expression in other parts of the Prayer Book. He will find, I think, that if, in the prayer before us, it is held, to prove that (according to the teaching of our Service) it must be possible to receive the *res sacramenti* unworthily; then, by the application of the very same argument, our Prayer Book must be held to teach plainly that it must be possible—

* Compare the words of Cranmer quoted below (p. 518) "that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same, that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished." (On Lord's Supper, p. 79.)

See also especially the passage from the Homily, quoted in Appendix, p. 496.

† See Appendix, Note G.

(1) that our Heavenly Father may *so* assist us by His grace, that we may NOT "continue in that holy fellowship."

(2) that the ministers and stewards of Christ's mysteries may *so* prepare Christ's way, by turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, that at His second coming we may NOT be found an acceptable people in His sight.

(3) that we may be *so* joined together in unity of spirit by the doctrine of Apostles and Prophets, as NOT to be made an holy temple acceptable unto God.

(4) that we may *so* follow God's blessed saints in all virtuous and godly living, that we may NOT come to the joys which God hath prepared for them that unfeignedly love Him.

(5) that we may *so* faithfully serve God in this life, that we MAY *fail* to attain His everlasting promise.

(6) that God would *so* vouchsafe to send His blessing on His servants, that they may NOT obey His will, nor abide in His love.

(7) that God would *so* turn His anger from us and make haste to help us, that we may NOT live with Him in the world to come.

(8) that we may *so* be led in the knowledge and obedience of God's Word, that in the end we may NOT obtain everlasting life.

These examples (viewed, NOT *separately*, but ALL *together*) will suffice, I think, to show that, whether we like to regard the word "*so*" as emphatic or not (in this prayer) any argument as to doctrine built on so weak a foundation must fall to the ground.

I have spoken of such arguments as microscopical

arguments. I trust in speaking thus, and in using such illustrations as I have used, I may not seem to have been treating the matter in a way unseemly or unbecoming. It is with no desire to treat the arguments of the Ritualists contemptuously that I have resorted to them. If any apology is considered due for what I have said, or the way I have said it, I trust such apology will be accepted with an assurance that I am very far from wishing to treat any of these arguments or their maintainers with levity or with any want of due courtesy. I gladly bear testimony to the ability with which those arguments have been supported, and the zeal which has been manifested in their defence. But still the truth is the truth. And some such illustrations appear to me best capable of bringing out clearly into view what I cannot but regard as the truth in this matter. To some extent I shall be obliged myself to use the microscope in this paper. Possibly, to some minds really desirous to look at these things fairly, and to weigh them according to their true weight, some of these matters may seem to be more important than they have appeared to me, and I may be thought to have been making them too small, and treating them too lightly.* Possibly I may have erred in that direction, though I hope I have not desired to do so. But the point I wish to press is this,—that for a true view of the testimony borne by this service to the matter before us, we are called upon primarily to look round on the service "in the length and the breadth of it." It must be allowed by all, I think, that such arguments as these are *comparatively* insignificant.

* On this account, I have given in *the notes*, an amount of attention to them, far beyond what, in my own judgment, is due to them.

We have the broad field before us of our Church's "Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper." Surely here we should be as "in a land flowing with milk and honey." And then we are constrained to ask—Are we to be set to look for that which is regarded as the milk and honey hidden sparsely in such recondite recesses as these?

No. But we will stand and look round, and ask our readers to look round with us on the broad surface before us.

Let it not be taken amiss, if I venture to express a conviction that this controversy only needs to be driven out of holes and corners, and brought well out into the open.

Let us cease, then, from analysing phrases and expressions which surely were never meant to be analysed thus. Let us take a comprehensive view of the Service in its grand features and its bold outline. And looking round, let us ask—*Where*, here, are we to find this all-important teaching (in the view of some) of a real presence in the elements and of an oral reception? Where is the teaching of reception by unbelievers? Where is the doctrine of a sacrifice of Christ's present body and blood offered up in the elements, and so pleaded before the Father by the priest? Where is the teaching of a presence to be adored under the forms of bread and wine?

Where are these teachings? these doctrines which are to hold as *de fide?*

Truly, if they are to be found anywhere, they must be found "under the microscope."

And what then about this absence—this absence of all that should give to our Service the character and impress of the "Real Objective Presence"?

Surely we may do right to enquire about it, and take

note of the answer we receive—that this absence came of a CLEARING, and that the *date* of this CLEARING was the *date* of the REFORMATION, and that the *work* of this CLEARING was the *work* of the REFORMERS.

And shall we not do well also to note, what the history of our Church will tell us—that for such-like CLEARING work many perished at the stake, and gave their bodies to be burned, rather than put a hand to build up what thus they had destroyed?

Yes. But we must do more. We must mark well that this CLEARING work of our Reformers was not directed only to the removal of the superstitions which clung to *transubstantiation*. Their axes and saws were not used only on such strong boughs of Popery as this. They were not satisfied with cutting down the topmost branches of the trees. No. That which, in the sight of those who hold the Real Objective Presence, should be as the milk and honey of the goodly land, in the eyes of our Reformers was all as gall and wormwood. And their mattocks and pick-axes were at work *under ground*. They were resolved, if possible, to leave NO ROOT that should bear such gall and wormwood.

And the history of the *clearing* which our Communion Service has seen, is the history of an *uprooting*. It is the history of a work carried on in the spirit of him whom God appointed as the foreman in the work, and who took up his tools crying to his fellows—"The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the REAL PRESENCE

of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the SACRIFICE and oblation of Christ *made by the priest*, for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions. These injuries to Christ be so intolerable, that no Christian heart can willingly bear them."*

It was with such words as† these, and in such a spirit as this, that Archbishop Cranmer set to "his hand and his axe with the rest" at the great CLEARING work which was before them.

And the result of such a determination, such a settled purpose to leave *no root* that might spring up and bear the gall and wormwood of a "Real Objective Presence" and its concomitant doctrines, is seen in the matters of difference between the first and second Prayer-books of Edward the Sixth. The first Prayer-book indeed was quite capable of being used without offence. In it all that could be said even to look like transubstantiation has been lopped off, the sacrificial character was maimed, and the adoration was gone,‡ and there was nothing on the surface that must needs have seemed evil, if only it were interpreted according to the sense of the Articles subsequently published.§ But like the phrase in the Notice at the end of the first book of Homilies, there was something in it which might seem at least to have something of a *sound*, or perhaps something of *flavour* of a "Real Presence" in a Lutheran

* See Paper, No. I, p. 21.
† See Appendix, Note H.
‡ See Appendix, Note I.
§ See Appendix, Note K.

sense. There were ROOTS. And before the spirit which animated Cranmer and his associates, the roots must be rooted up. They could not rest satisfied till they had applied axe and hand to a more thorough CLEARING. These causes of offence must be removed. In that new CLEARING there must be a more thorough *uprooting*.* And axes and hands went to work again, not indeed, with intemperate precipitancy, not with fanatical disregard of ancient landmarks, not without the wisdom and prudence and caution of well-learned and able Divines :†—not at all in the spirit of those, who, for no sufficient cause, would prefer that which comes new ‡ from their own pen to those sacred and time honoured heritages of the Christian Church,§ which having been received from the times of purer faith, might well be cleansed from the superstitions and corruptions with which after ages had encrusted them ; but still, not the less, yea rather all the more, and all the more notably, with stedfast and deliberate resolution, they went to work; with earnest and settled purpose to clear away whatever remained in our Communion Service, that might give reasonable cause for offence, or occasion for the planting and growing and spreading of superstitious practices or dangerous doctrines. And as the result we have now an order for the administration of the Lord's Supper, in which it requires a microscope to discover the root of a weed left behind.

* See Appendix, Note L.

† See Hook's Lives of Archbishops. Series ii., vol. ii., pp. 225, 226, 268, sqq.

‡ See Appendix, Note M.

§ "Sudden changes without substantial necessary causes, and the heady setting forth of extremities, we did never love." (Ridley, as quoted by Dean Hook in "The Church and the Age," p. 29.)

No doubt it may be alleged (and few I imagine will dispute it) that in Cranmer's mild and gentle disposition there was that, the tendency of which was sometimes to make his policy seem feeble rather than firm, hesitating rather than decided, slow and cautious rather than vigorous.*

No doubt it may be urged that there were those at the time (and there have been some such ever since), who were dissatisfied with the result, and regarded Cranmer and his associates as being even weak and half-hearted in their work of Reformation. But was Cranmer ever accused by such, of leaving in our Liturgy any roots of the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence? If not; does not the very slowness and caution and moderation of the Reformers of our Liturgy make all the more evident and conspicuous the purpose and resolution which, in this matter at least, made their action to be vigorous, and their work to be thorough? In this particular, certainly, Cranmer's convictions were strong, and his hand was not feeble, and his purpose was stedfast, and his spirit was resolute, and his mind knew no indecision.

Cranmer and his associates may have been slow in casting off the faith of a Corporal Presence. But, having after much consideration, deliberately repudiated it at last, they were thoroughly and heartily in earnest in the work of uprooting it.

Cranmer was not always† irresolute. And of the doctrine of the Eucharist, it may be said—Here his strength lay. In this matter, when (after the most careful investi-

* See Hallam's Constitutional History, vol. i., p. 99. Edit. 1867

† See Hook's Lives; Series ii., vol. ii., pp. 23, 24, 88, 174, 303 304, 363, 376.

gation) his long cherished views of the Presence had quite given way; when he had made up his mind, and put on his armour; then he came forth as a champion, with an invincible energy and power and determination, such as could not but win the admiration, even of some who had been disposed to mistrust him. And then with no hesitating and wavering mind, with no faint and feeble purpose (we may be sure) he took his place*—the foremost place—among those, who, with minds not less earnest in the work than his own, sat down to revise and make perfect the Communion Service of the Church of England.†

If, in arranging the Liturgy of the English Church, our Reformers had acted as men having received as their orders "Cut away everything; spare nothing," then would the clearing process have afforded no special historical argument as to the repudiation of any particular doctrine.

But, if, on the other hand, our Reformers have acted rather, as in obedience to such a command as this‡—

* No doubt there may have been on the commission men with tempers, on the whole, less conservative than Cranmer's; and it is quite possible that Cranmer may have exercised, to some extent, a restraining influence. But I can hardly conceive it possible, that any unprejudiced mind, acquainted with Cranmer's writings, can doubt for a moment, that Cranmer's own mind was fully and thoroughly in accord with, and went heartily and earnestly to work with, the *animus* which resolved on, initiated, guided, and effected the changes in Edward's second Book. (See Cardwell's Two Liturgies, Preface, pp. 29, 30, 35.) And the same, I feel persuaded, would be true of Ridley also.

† See Appendix, Note N.

‡ Let the reader mark how forcibly this principle, conservative of what is old, where it may be spared, is expressed in what is written (by the pen, probably, of Cranmer) at the commencement of the

"Spare where you may; reject nothing rashly; don't cut away without cause;" then the marked and consistent rejection of passages or expressions seeming to favour a particular doctrine, must be allowed to afford a historical argument of our Church's repudiation of that particular doctrine.

Again, if our present Liturgy had been the result of a single review of ancient offices, then we should not have had anything like so forcible an argument as we now have against the Real Corporal Presence; for it might have been said that all the changes resulted from a strong repugnance to the Romish doctrine of *transubstantiation only*. As it is, we know that whatever sounded of distinctively* Romish doctrine had been eleminated from Edward's first Book. It will hardly be maintained that there were any roots of transubstantiation left. But the changes in the second

Prayer Book, under the heading "Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained." There it is said "Surely where the old may be well used, there they cannot reasonably reprove the old only for their age, without bewraying of their own folly. For in such a case they ought rather to have reverence unto them for their antiquity, if they will declare themselves to be more studious of unity and concord, than of innovations and new-fangledness, which (as much as may be with true setting forth of Christ's Religion) is always to be eschewed." And let it be marked also, how, along with this, there is the determination to abolish and not spare, when "the abuses could not well be taken away, the thing remaining still."

* Thus Soames says of Edward's *First* Book. "In fact, every thing, properly denominated Romish, in the established liturgies, was unsparingly retrenched; and to the new work were transferred those features only of its immediate predecessor which are among the venerable remains of the ancient Latin Church. This enlightened policy proved the means of introducing to the nation a service remarkably resembling that established in Britain at a remote period

manifest a purpose too plain* to be disputed, of expunging passages which might seem to give shelter—not for transubstantiation—but for the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence.

Indeed, upon the whole, nothing could be more judicious than the conduct of those entrusted with this delicate commission; for although the first service-book contained some concessions to Romish prejudices, afterwards properly denied, yet these were sanctioned by Early usage among Christians, and it justly seemed expedient to deal cautiously with popular prepossessions." (History of Reformation, vol. iii., pp. 369—371.)

* Thus, concerning the *first* Book, Hilles had written to Bullinger June, 1549: "We have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nuremberg Churches and some of those in Saxony . . . for the preservation of the public peace, they afford *no cause of offence to the Lutherans*." (Original Letters. P. S. Edit., p. 266.)

That there was a complete change in this respect in the Second Book, we have the testimony of Procter, who says "The *great doctrinal alteration* referred to the presence of Christ in the consecrated Elements of the Eucharist. In the book of 1549, the Communion Service had been so constructed as to be consistent with the belief of a real, and perhaps of a substantial and corporal presence. But the alterations in 1552 were such as to authorize and foster the belief that the consecrated elements had no new virtues imparted to them, and that Christ was present in the Eucharist in no other manner than as He is ever present to the prayers of the faithful. The pale of Church communion was thus *enlarged* for the more earnest reformers, but *closed against the slightest leaning* to Mediæval doctrine." (On Common Prayer, pp. 33, 34, in part quoted from Cardwell's Conferences, Introd., p. 6. See also Archbishop Laurence in "Doctrine of the Church of England on Baptism," p. 33; and Professor J. J. Blunt's "Reformation in England," p. 208; Edit. 1832.)

I venture to express an opinion that the Lutheran character of the *first* Book of Edward has sometimes been over estimated. It would be far from the truth, I think, to say that in it was *taught* the Lutheran

Acting on principles which were conservative of what might be preserved, the highest and strongest principles of our Reformers were destructive of *this*. Sparing what might be spared, they knew nothing of listening to a voice which would bid them spare *this*.

Let those who question that the CLEARING process of the Reformation aimed at such an UPROOTING of the doctrine of the Real or Corporal Presence institute a comparison between the Prayer Book of 1549 and the Prayer Book of 1552,* and herein let them mark especially *three* things:—

1st. The Rejection of all forms of expression such as might seem to teach the communicants to seek for the Presence of Christ in the Consecrated Elements.

2nd. The entire removal of the Sacrificial Character from the Service.

3rdly. The important significance of the Change in the Prayer of consecration.

doctrine of the Eucharist. It would be a more correct statement t say that, *unexplained*, it might have been understood as making roo for that doctrine, and affording some cover for those who taught it.

Bucer said of the *first* book—"Egi gratias Deo, qui dedisset vo has ceremonias eo puritatis reformare, nec enim quicquam in ill deprehendi, quod non sit ex verbo Dei desumptum, aut saltem ei no adversetur, commode acceptum. Nam non desunt paucula quædam quæ si quis non candide interpretetur, videri queant, non satis cu verbo Dei congruere." (Scripta Anglicana, Basil., 1557, p. 456.)

In the first Book of Edward, the repudiation of *Romish* doctrine distinct, of *Lutheran* doctrine not distinct. Edward's second boo is the first book made *fully perfect* by such *explanations* of the doub ful expresssions in the first as add distinctness to the repudiation Lutheran doctrine also.

* See Appendix, Note O.

I. *As to the first of these three things;—Four examples may be given. (1.) In the Prayer Book of 1549 we have the words, "And to the end that we should alway remember the exceeding love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood-shedding He hath obtained to us, He hath left in those holy mysteries, as a pledge of His love, and a continual remembrance of the same, His own blessed Body and precious Blood, for us to feed upon spiritually, to our endless comfort and consolation."

In 1552, this is changed. There is now no word of the body and blood of Christ being *left* to us "in those holy mysteries." But instead we are told "He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love and continual remembrance of His death, to our great and endless comfort." The change was not necessary, but it was clearly significant.

(2.) Again. In a Prayer which in 1549 followed immediately on the Prayer of Consecration were the words "And here we offer and present unto Thee (O Lord) ourself, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee; humbly beseeching that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction."

These words might indeed seem to imply such a Presence in the Elements that in receiving them, those who were partakers of this Holy Communion might *unworthily* receive Christ's body and blood. But in 1552 this ROOT, out of which evil might grow, was removed, and instead the words

* See Appendix, Note P.

were inserted, "Beseeching Thee, that all we who are partakers of this Holy Communion, may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction."

(3.) Again the Prayer near the end of the Service commencing "Almighty and everliving God" is carried on in the Book of 1549 in these words, "we most heartily thank Thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feed us *in these holy mysteries*, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of Thy favour and goodness towards us." The words might have been soundly interpreted. But very indicative of the *clearing axe*, and the stedfast purpose of the Reformers is the change in 1552 which gives us these words, "We most heartily thank Thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have *duly received these holy mysteries*,* with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ."

(4.) Again in 1549, a Rubric at the end of the Service declares, "Men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

In 1552 this rubric, which, unexplained, looked too much like a Corporal Presence in the Elements was uprooted and swept quite away.

These changes may, not one of them, perhaps, be regarded as highly important, viewed singly and separately. But their true significance is to be estimated by a view of them in conjunction, not only with one another, but with the other and far more important changes, which are yet to be noticed

* See Appendix, Note Q.

II. The second point to be observed is the Removal of the Sacrificial character from the Service. I mean of course the word "sacrificial" here to point to the meaning of "*sacrifice*" maintained by our opponents, as something entirely different from mere commemorative sacrifice, and the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies, and the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

With reference to this point, it is to be observed that there was a very significant change in the very title of the service. In 1549 the title was "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." Here indeed is an indication of a desire not to appropriate a name which in the ears of men in those days *sounded* of sacrifice. But in the Second Book the word is cleared away altogether, and the title stands, "The order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion."*

So also the word "Altar" which was retained in 1549 is entirely removed from the Book of 1552. And on the significance of this change the following words may be taken as a comment:—

"When the same thing is signified, it may not be of much importance by what name it is called; but the distinction between an Altar and a Communion Table is in itself essential and deeply founded in the most important difference in matters of faith between Protestants and Romanists; namely, in the different notions of the nature of the Lord's Supper which prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation, and those which were introduced by the Reformers. By the former it was considered as a sacrifice of the body and blood of the

* See Appendix, Note R.

Saviour.* The Altar was the place on which the sacrifice was to be made; the elements were to be consecrated, and being so consecrated were treated as the actual body and blood of the victim. The Reformers, on the other hand, considered the Holy Communion not as a sacrifice but as a †feast, to be celebrated at the Lord's Table." (Final Judgment in the case of "Liddell v. Weston," quoted in Principles at Stake, p. 164.)

But as to this removal of the sacrificial character from the Book of 1552, let me quote the words of another.‡

"Mr. Stuart says: 'The Eucharistic sacrifice, then, consists in offering before God, as well as man, that memorial of the death of Christ which our Lord himself ordained.' He then refers to a passage in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.: 'We Thy humble servants do celebrate, and

* While the name "altar" remained, it was *explained* as referring to the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," (see Edward's Letter to Ridley, as given in Bulley's Variations, p. 147,) and therefore as giving no support to that sacrificial doctrine which belongs to the Real Objective Presence, and which our Church was well understood to have altogether rejected. "We cannot well grant that they, in their masking Mass offer any such sacrifice, for they boast that they offer *reale corpus et realem sanguinem*, as they term it. The holy father Irenæus doth write, that the thing that is offered, receiveth his dignity and worthiness of him that doth offer, and that the sacrifice is accepted of God, because he that offereth it is accepted of God. Upon this make argument—Every person that doth offer is of more worthiness than the thing which he offereth. The priest doth offer the body of Christ: ergo, the priest is of more worthiness than the body of Christ O blasphemy intolerable!" (Bishop Alley's Πτωχομουσείον. The Poor Man's Library, tom. i., p. 218 *a*; Edit. Day, 1565.)

† See Appendix, Note S.

‡ The Rev. Joseph Bardsley, in "Truths for the Times" (Hunt pp. 92—94.

make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make.' He then adds: 'This is, simply, that chief and central act of Christian worship, which in the Church of England we commonly call the Eucharistic Sacrifice,* and which is still called amongst Roman Catholics, as it used to be called among ourselves, the Mass.'† On this passage I desire to make a few remarks. In order to obtain even the semblance of evidence in favour of his view, he has to refer to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. Mr. Stuart knows perfectly well, that we are no more bound by that passage than we are by the Roman Catholic Missal. The very fact that it was expunged when the Prayer Book was revised (in 1552),‡ proves that the Reformers felt that its retention would at least seem to sanction a doctrine which involves blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.§ I am astonished that Mr. Stuart should refer the passage. The late Archdeacon Wilberforce,‖ in his book on the Eucharist, distinctly

* See Appendix C to Charge of Bishop of St. David's, 1866; especially pp. 141—144.

† See Appendix, Note T.

‡ Yet Mr. Orby Shipley regards the use of the word *Mass*, "with a national prefix," as "authorized to English Churchmen who require such authority, by the employment of the term in the First English Book of Common Prayer, A.D. 1549." (Preface to "Ritual of the Altar," pp. 14, 15, note.)

§ See Appendix, Note U.

‖ "About a year after the publication of King Edward's First Book, Archbishop Cranmer abandoned his belief in the Real Presence —a change which seems to have been very acceptable to the young king and his favourites. By virtue of the more than Papal power which he assumed, Edward soon superseded the Book which he had formerly sanctioned, and imposed his Second Book of 1552 upon the

acknowledges that the removal of this passage stripped our Communion Service of its sacrificial character. I need scarcely say he advocated the views held by Mr. Stuart and the advanced Ritualists. His words, which deserve special attention, are these: 'The Service was divested of its sacrificial character, and no longer bore witness, as in early times,* to the great event which is transacted at the altar. This was done, both by mutilating the Prayer of Oblation, which had been retained in the Book of 1548, and by placing it after, instead of before, the Communion.'† Here, then, is enough to damp the ardour, one would think, of the warmest advocate of the Mass,—to be bound to use a Service for the offering of the Holy Sacrifice, which is divested‡ of its sacrificial character, and which no longer bears witness

nation. By this means, as well as by the Forty-two Articles which were published the same year, and in like manner without any spiritual sanction, the Zuinglo-Calvinistic system took possession of our Churches. . . . . The ruling party had adopted the Zuinglian theory, and supposed the holy Eucharist to be merely a commemorative feast. For if Christ's real presence be denied, the primitive doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice must be abandoned also; so that to have maintained a spiritual participation in the offering, would have been to keep up a practice which had lost its meaning. It was only consistent, therefore, to accommodate the usages of the Church to its new doctrines. The Service, consequently, was divested of its sacrificial character, and no longer bore witness, as in early times, to the great event which is transacted at the altar. This was done both by mutilating the Prayer of Oblation, which had been retained in the Book of 1548, and by placing it after, instead of before, the Communion." (Wilberforce on Eucharist, pp. 438—440.)

* See Appendix, Note V.

† See Hickes's Treatises, vol. i., pp. 126, 127; Anglo-Cath. Lib. Edit.

‡ See Appendix, Note W.

to the great event transacted at the altar. But here, again, the editor of the *Directorium Anglicanum* suggests a way of getting over what to ordinary minds would appear an insuperable difficulty; viz., by offering up a silent prayer after the words of consecration, during which the priest is to repeat secretly the prayer of the Roman Catholic Missal, "offering up the body and blood of the Saviour as a sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead."†

Let me conclude this portion of the subject by quoting very weighty words of Archbishop Longley, written shortly before his death:—

"Seeing, then, the complexion which the Reformers, with all these expressions of respect for the ancient doctors of the Church, have given to our Communion Service, it seems impossible to doubt that they had weighed well those passages of the Fathers which are generally adduced in favour of the sacrificial view, and had judged that the corrections and explanations to which I have alluded were the true key to their real opinions. Wherefore they treated the Holy Office throughout as merely the commemoration of the great Sacrifice, or if it is to be treated as a sacrifice‡ in itself only as a spiritual sacrifice or act of worship, without any reference to the offering of the elements, either before or after consecration."§

III. The third point to be marked is the important significance of the change in the Prayer of Consecration.

In 1549, we have the words—"Hear us (O merciful

* See Appendix, Note X.

† See Appendix, Note Y.

‡ See Appendix, Note Z.

§ Posthumous Charge of Archbishop Longley, p. 34.

Father) we beseech Thee; and with Thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ," etc.*

But in the Consecration Prayer as altered in 1552, there is no asking at all for anything that might seem like a change in the elements, no asking that they may even BE anything TO US — though such an expression might have been *explained* in a very *sound sense.* No. The uprooting process must do a clearing work even here. And in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., the Consecration Prayer only asks that "we receiving these Thy creatures †

* In Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," p. 143, note *r*, instead of the quotation from the *Consecration Prayer* of Edward's First Book (as so highly approved by Bucer), should have been given, I think, the words of the Prayer of Humble Access. *That* prayer was indeed commended by Bucer. But the *Consecration Prayer* (especially the part quoted) Bucer judged very objectionable; and the change made in Edward's *Second* Book was entirely in accord with his suggestions. (See Bucer's *Censura* in *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 456 sqq., Basil, 1577, and Nicholls's Additional Notes, p. 53; also Perry in "Declaration concerning Kneeling," pp. 404, 405, note.)

† "In 1552 the important step is taken of declaring the elements to be, even at the moment of reception, 'Thy creatures of bread and wine.' Moreover, the partaking of Christ's body and blood, though dependent on the reception of the bread and wine, is treated as a separate reception—*i.e.* a spiritual one. And the introduction into this sentence of the words 'according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion,' seems intended to suggest the thought which should be uppermost in the mind at the moment of reception; viz., not that the bread and wine are received as His body and blood, but that they are received in remembrance, etc.; as He said, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'" (Principles at Stake, p. 272.)

of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesu Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood."

Of this prayer as thus altered it may be truly said, that when it asks that in receiving the elements we *may be* partakers of the "*res sacramenti*," it asks that which *does* indeed imply that the consecrated bread and wine may be received where the "res sacramenti" is not received; and therefore that there cannot be any such a Real Objective Presence of the body and blood of Christ under the forms of the bread and wine, as our opponents maintain.*

Dr. Grabe says—"The faithful may be, and are even by the Church of England, supposed to be made *partakers* of Christ's body and blood *spiritually*, without such a *mystical change* of the bread and wine; and consequently, the priest who *prayeth the former* doth thereby NOT *pray for the latter*. Supposing there was a necessary connexion between these two, ... yet if he that asketh the former disbelieveth or denieth the latter, and therefore *putteth the same, on purpose, out of his prayer*, it may reasonably be questioned, if not denied, that God will give Him what he doth not believe, and consequently doth not ask." (Grabe: "De Forma Consecrationis Eucharistiæ, etc.; or, a Defence of the Greek Church against the Roman," pp. 90, 91; London, 1721.)

Is not the *change* in the Consecration Prayer utterly unaccountable on any other supposition than this—that the Church of England *would not have* her ministers pray for *the latter*, or, at all events, desires *rather* to discourage than encourage their doing so; and that in a very marked way, seeing SHE hath *put the same on purpose out of* HER *prayer*?

Grabe's view, however, falls far short of the Real Objective Presence. His is the presence in the consecrated symbols, *not* of the *substance*, but of the *virtue* of our Lord's body and blood. (See pp. 75 and 92.)

Let us hear what is said by Dr. Brett, the non-juror, of this new Consecration Prayer:—

"I was and am very desirous to believe that the Church of England holds the doctrine so plainly taught by our Saviour. But I know not how to reconcile the Consecration Prayer in the present established Liturgy to this doctrine; for that makes a plain distinction betwixt the bread and wine and our Saviour's body and blood; when, as Mr. Spinckes shows, and the words will bear no other construction than that, it was the bread which Christ said was His body; whereas the Consecration Prayer evidently supposes them to be two distinct things. 'Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, may be partakers of Christ's body and blood.' Which manifestly implies the bread and wine to be distinct or different things from the body and blood. For if the bread be Christ's body, as Mr. Spinckes proves the words of institution teach, then he that receives or partakes of the bread must be a partaker of the body. And except they are supposed to be two things, then the prayer is that we, receiving or partaking of the body and blood of Christ, may be partakers of His body and blood." *

"Such," says Dean Goode, "is the statement of a learned Divine, holding the doctrine, not† of the presence of the

* See Appendix, Note A A.

† Dr. Brett is exceedingly clear in his teaching as to the impossibility of the true body of Christ being in substance present in or with the elements. Thus, for example, he writes—"We *can't* partake of His *natural* body, that is absent from us as far as heaven is from the earth. But His virtual body, His body in *spirit and in power*, ... is the body He may give and has given to be eaten and drunk by us in the Holy Communion." (On the Eucharist, p. 42; London, 1736. See also p. 43.)

natural body and blood of Christ, but of their life-giving virtue, in the consecrated bread and wine, so as to constitute a virtual presence of that body and blood in them, and desirous of finding that the Church of England, in her Communion Service, sanctioned this modified view of the doctrine of a Real Presence. He declares it utterly impossible to reconcile this passage with that view."*

How much more, it may be asked, is this prayer (on the face of it) repugnant to the doctrine (as now taught) of the Real Objective Presence?

Before passing on, the reader must be asked to observe that, in the case of all these changes which we have been marking as intimating the uprooting principle which guided our Reformers in rejecting what might look like a "Real Objective Presence," THESE CHANGES ABIDE; and abide in spite of endeavours made to remove them.† Slight alterations have since been made. The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. has not been left untouched.

Nay: let me not desire to convey any false impression. Let me not seek to present to the reader one side only of the truth. Let it, in all fairness, be confessed, and confessed without grudging, that our Communion Service has not been left altogether untouched by the influence of what may be called, perhaps a reactionary movement‡—reactionary, at least, in so far as some may think, or may have thought that in the reign of King Edward the axes of our Reformers struck too deep, and while rooting up the tares, disturbed

* See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 616.

† See Appendix, Note BB.

‡ See Appendix, Note C C.

sometimes the roots of good wheat. Such reactionary influence, indeed, so far as it has affected our Prayer Book, I cannot but think, has sometimes been much over-estimated.

But, be this as it may, the point which I desire to insist upon is this, that the broad view and the main features are unchanged.* And I think it most important for us in this matter to take as far as possible, a broad view, and rise above mere details. In the main, we may surely say, the substance of our Communion Book is unaltered.

Still we look in vain for the restoration of such expressions as before looked most like a Corporal Presence. Still we look in vain for any Invocation of the Holy Spirit on the Elements.† Still we look in vain to find in the Consecration Prayer any asking for any such inherent change in God's creatures as the Objective theory requires. Still we look in vain for any such‡ sacrificial language as the maintainers of that theory desire. Still we look in vain for any such adoration as we are told a "Real Objective Presence" demands.

Those who regard themselves as sacrificing priests ministering at an altar may indeed, using our service, seek to supply its deficiencies by unauthorized postures, and words spoken in secret. But not the less I think, must our maimed service (in their view) by that very maiming bear witness against them, bear witness, I mean, by what

* Observe how Bishop Hall treats such alterations, in Works, vol. ix., pp. 646, 738, 739; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

† See Appendix, Note D D.

‡ The removal of the predominant sacrificial idea in Edward's First Book was conspicuous. But now "the Anglican Liturgy, *far as any such sacrifice is concerned, presents* AN ENTIRE BLANK." (Dr. Heurtley on Declaration, p. 28.)

absent, and absent because removed, that it does not hold, and does not teach, and is determined not to teach what, in their view is the great doctrine of the Eucharist.*

After all that has been done in subsequent revisions the great and important changes which indicate the rejection of the Corporal Presence, remain substantially inviolate.

Doubtless, it may be urged, that after all, the evidence produced has failed altogether to prove that our Communion Service contains any DENIAL of the Corporal Presence—that no attempt even has been made to show that in this service our Church has said a plain "No" to that doctrine—that all that has been contended for has been her simply not saying, and refusing to say to it her "Yes."

But let the subject be fairly considered in view of the question "What is it which we ought reasonably to look for in such a service?" Let it be granted—and I trust it *will* be granted as an axiomatic truth—that an office for administration of the Holy Communion ought to contain (1) NO *negations* of doctrine, (2) but the *teaching* TO THE FULL† of

* The following words of a Romanist may have weight with some: "Anglican divines themselves have admitted the error. Grabe wished the Mass could be restored. Others have said that the Reformation went too far. The Ritualists of the present day endeavour to supplement the Prayer Book from the Sarum rite. Yet what is all this but a confession of being in the wrong, that only makes the original crime more glaring." (Canon Estcourt on the Dogmatic Teaching of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 59.)

† It may be said against this, that the Missal does not assert Transubstantiation. (See Principles at Stake, p. 290.) Our reply is, that thus the Missal bears its testimony against the novel dogmas of Rome. (See Bishop Patrick, Christian Sacrifice, pp. 56, 57. Edit. 1690; and Conference between Rainolds and Hart, pp. 533,

the positive doctrine of the Eucharist. And then *absence of teaching*, and *silence as to doctrine* in such an office, must be held to be a *significant* absence, and a SPEAKING silence.*

534, London, 1598; also Bishop Babington's Works, pp. 255, 256, London, 1615; and Dr. Heurtley on Declaration, p. 28.)

Bishop Harold Browne says, "They [the primitive liturgies] contain no invocation of saints, no mention of purgatory, no doctrine of transubstantiation. Even the Roman canon of the Mass has descended to the present day so far free from such admixtures as to be a *witness against* the corruptions of later days." (Preface to Prayer Book interleaved, p. x.)

But besides this, it must in fairness be allowed that the cases of the Missal and the Prayer Book are not parallel. What the Missal has not, IT NEVER HAD. What the Prayer Book has not, *has been* CAST AWAY. Suppose now, that we knew as a historical fact, that the Missal *did* formerly contain several passages teaching plainly the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and that by the authority of the Council of Trent all those passages has been very carefully and thoroughly expurgated; would not the Missal then give evidence (as far as it went) of the *Rejection* of the dogma of Transubstantiation?

* Archdeacon Freeman takes this truth as the foundation of an argument against their being an object of Divine worship enshrined in the Elements, when he says that "it was evidently *unknown to the mind*, BECAUSE *unrecognised by the Ritual of* the first ages." (Rites and Ritual, p. 36.)

Mr. Maskell says, "The liturgy is the great storehouse in which we are *to look for and find* the necessary declarations of the HIGHEST *Catholic truths*. . . . This may be relied upon as a mark which cannot deceive." (Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, Pref., p. lvi.)

As regards *our own* Communion service, it is to be observed that the fifty-seventh Canon distinctly declares that "the doctrine both of baptism and of the Lord's Supper is *so sufficiently* set down in the Book of Common Prayer to be used in the administration of the said sacraments, as NOTHING CAN *be added unto it* that is material and necessary."

Much in the same way as when a witness has every inducement, and every reason for saying "Yes," and we know that (for some cause or other) his lips are sealed against a "No"—if he stands silent—we argue that that silence is denial; so, I think, from this silence in our Prayer Book, where silence *should not be* if our Church desired to say "Yes" to this doctrine, from the absence of this teaching where teaching on this subject should be TO THE FULL; we might fairly argue a strong presumption of our Church's denial, even if that silence and that absence stood altogether unaccounted for and otherwise unexplained.

How much more when we cannot but know that that silence is silence constrained, and that absence comes only of careful elimination, forcible expulsion, and deliberate rejection!* Surely we are not to forbid history to throw any light whatever on the interpretation of this silence.

* Canon Estcourt argues that "those who receive and use the Book of Common Prayer . . . do by that their formal act make a denial of the [Roman] Catholic faith. . . . They deny the Holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist. They deny the priesthood of the Church. They deny the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist. They profess and assert that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is only a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice . . . and that Christ our Lord in the Eucharist is given, received, and eaten spiritually only, and not sacramentally or really." (Dogmatic Teaching of Common Prayer, p. 57.)

These words are not without their value as showing how the doctrine of our Prayer Book strikes one looking at it from a Roman Catholic point of view. Mr. Humphrey, indeed (Principles at Stake, p. 290) passes something of a censure on this "sweeping conclusion." No doubt there are one or two words used by Canon Estcourt which need a caution against misunderstanding. But so far as it applies to those who unfeignedly *assent* and *consent* to our Service *as it is*, I

Neither may we refuse to receive the light which is thrown upon it from the corresponding expurgation of our Ordinal. And certainly we are not to reject the light thrown upon it from other utterances of our Church, which in suitable places speak her "No" in language which ought to be plain.

At any rate our Mother Church may truly and justly ask of us her sons and daughters such a question as this —"What could I have done more, in such an office as this, to warn you against a doctrine which I trust all of you will renounce?" And if it be said in answer—"Make a new Directory of your own, on another model altogether"—then would there not be some just ground for complaint, that her children should refuse to believe what she would teach, and understand what she would say, until she had quite taken from them an heir-loom, which in wisdom and love she has sought to preserve, that it might be accounted by them a privilege and a blessing?

But we may go further and say, that our Church *has* done more. For though our Communion Service does not, as it should not, deal in negations; yet we have as an appendage of the office a remarkable statement, which can scarcely be regarded as anything less than a very clear and positive denial of the doctrine in question. This statement is what has commonly been called the Black Rubric. And a brief notice of it must conclude this paper.

By the "Black Rubric" we mean the declaration which

cannot see how the conclusion is to be avoided, if our Service is to be viewed in the light—not of any mere inferences from what may be guessed to be probably the cause of this change or that omission, but of the *plain facts* of our Church's history and our Reformer's work.

stands at the end of our Communion Service. It is as follows :—*

"Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling ; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue ;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved ; It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received or unto any Corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored ; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians ;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here ; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

This declaration was first inserted in the Second Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth, and there bore its witness to a steadfast and determined purpose to set to the axe to the root of superstition.

It bore its strong and decided testimony against any Real and Essential Presence of Christ's body and blood in the Elements. In the Prayer Book of Elizabeth this was altogether omitted.† And it may be that it was prudentially

* See Appendix, Note E E.

† See Appendix, Note F F.

and* wisely omitted, because in the circumstances of the time, while the teaching of the Church of England was to be teaching with a clear voice, yet it may have been not desirable (with many of the people still under the influence of former teachings, who were to be conciliated rather than repelled) to make the Communion Book needlessly offensive.† Its restoration however was desired at the Savoy Conference in 1662, by the Puritan ministers. And though thought unnecessary‡ by the Bishops, IT WAS

* It should be remembered, however (though it seems to be sometimes lost sight of,—see Bulley's Variations, Pref., pp. xiii., xv.) that the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, as it came from the hands of the committee of Divines, *did* NOT *enjoin* kneeling at the reception, but left it indifferent to receive *kneeling* or *standing* (the committee, as represented by Geste, evidently giving the preference to *standing*. See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 54; Dugdale's Life of Geste, pp. 39, 149; Collier's Eccles. Hist., vol. vi., p. 249.) The change to kneeling appears to have been made by the Parliament, (see Strype, Annals, vol. i., chap. iv., p. 83, and Collier, vol. vi., p. 249,) or by the Queen (see Cardwell's Conferences, p. 21). The omission (or material alteration) therefore of the Rubric regarded as the work of the Divines, was *necessitated* by the fact that the posture of kneeling was not enjoined at all. Standing however and kneeling were both regarded as suitable postures for prayer. (See Geste in Dugdale's Life, p. 149.)

Moreover the Declaration was an appendage to, rather than (strictly speaking) any part of, the second Book of Edward. (See Bulley's Variations, pp. 221—223; and J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, p. 199, and Historical Introduction, p. xxxii.)

† See Burnet's History of Reformation, vol. ii., part i., p. 784, Edit. Oxford, 1829, and Goode on Eucharist, pp. 613-4. Also, Bulley's Variations, Preface, p. xiii. On the doctrinal bearing of this and the corresponding change in the 28th Article, see especially Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., pp. 64—67, and 76—78.

‡ See Appendix, Note G G.

RESTORED.* We may thank God it stands now at the end of our Communion Service with its emphatic protest against all adoration of the Sacrament, and its distinct declaration against the Corporal Presence.

But the force of this declaration and the strength of its protest are sought to be evaded. Indeed it must be plain that nothing short of evasion can serve the purpose of the 'Real Objective Presence." I must very briefly notice three schemes propounded for escaping its condemnation.

1. The first declares it not authoritative because it is neither a rubric nor a prayer.†

2. The second alleges that it cannot be against "The Real Presence" now, because as re-inserted the words 'Real and Essential Presence" were changed into "Corporal Presence."

3. The third holds "Real and Essential" as equivalent to "Corporal Presence," but maintains that by both is meant only a local, natural, *i.e.* a carnal, physical, organical Presence.‡

* "The Restoration of the Declaration was viewed with indignation by the Romanizing party. Burnet says that 'The Papists were highly offended when they saw such an express Declaration made against the REAL *presence*.' Sheldon, when interrogated by the Duke of York upon the subject, did not attempt to explain away its force, but threw the blame on Bishop Gauden." (Dr. Blakeney in Protestant Churchman, July 1869, p. 322. See Burnet's History of his own time, Edit.: Bohn, 1857, p. 125.)

† See Christian Remembrancer, Jan. 1866, p. 185. In Tract xc. it is said "The explanation before us adds, that it is philosophically impossible that it should be a particular kind of presence, a presence of which one can say 'it is here,' or which is 'local.' It states then a *philosophical deduction*, but to *such deduction* none of us have subscribed." (Pusey's Edition, 1866, p. 55.)

‡ See Appendix, Note H H.

To the first, I cannot think any answer to be necessary.

To the second, I answer, that "Corporal Presence" being in the language of our Reformers and their successors only another name for the phrase "Real and Essential Presence" (in the sense which it bore in the declaration) the reason for adopting or allowing the change at the last insertion need not be sought further,* than in a natural desire not to seem in any wise even verbally to condemn such men as Hooker, Jeremy Taylor and Morton, who (while still utterly repudiating that *doctrine* of a *Real* Corporal Presence which our Reformers rejected) had claimed on our behalf, or used in our service, (to convey the truth of our Reformed Doctrine,) that phrase† "the Real Presence" which in the earlier history of the Reformation (though always accepted in an *explained* sense) had been perhaps too commonly given over to the opponents, that it might signify the Corporal Presence of Romanists and Lutherans.

As commonly used in King Edward's days "Real Presence" meant a doctrine repudiated by our Reformers. As frequently used in days preceding the last review, it meant a doctrine which our Reformers and their successors contended for. Why retain such a phrase in a sentence of authoritative condemnation, when another was at hand, by which, with less ambiguity, might be expressed the doctrine which was to be condemned ?‡

* See Appendix, Note II.

† "It will be observed, that in both Rubrics, the question is as to the presence in *the Lord's Supper*, not specially in or under the Elements." (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 626.)

‡ Mr. Perry very justly says, "Although the substitution of 'corporal' for 'real and essential' was due primarily, as it seemed, to Bishop Gunning, the majority, at least, of the Bishops must have consented to the change." (On Declaration concerning Kneeling, pp.

As to the third (and the answer will apply to the second also) without wading into the depths of the controversy, I think it will be enough (for those at least who have followed the course of these papers) to call attention to the whole connected structure of the Rubric.

First, I must ask my readers to observe the reason which is given for kneeling—viz.: (1) to signify humble and grateful acknowledgment of benefits, and (2) to avoid profanation and disorder. Surely these are not the reasons to give if adoration is due to the very Presence of the Son of God there present under the forms of Bread* and Wine.†

337, 338.) What, therefore, may have been Bishop Gunning's views on the subject, appears to me to be a question immaterial to our purpose.

* See Dr. Heurtley's "Remarks on Declaration," p. 9, who quotes the words of the Bishops at the Savoy Conference.—"The posture of kneeling best suits at the Communion, as the most convenient, and so most decent for us, when we are to *receive, as it were from God's hand the* GREATEST OF SEALS *of the kingdom of heaven*."—Language as Dr. Heurtley observes) "strangely below the occasion, if that greatest of seals', be nothing less than the Lord Himself, veiled under the forms of bread and wine."

Dean Goode says, "To CONDEMN *kneeling* to the consecrated elements because of a supposed CORPORAL *presence* of Christ in them, and at the same time to ADVOCATE *kneeling* to them on account of a REAL *presence* of Christ in them, called 'supernatural,' 'essential,' and 'substantial,' is a distinction, which I trust, will ever be left in the hands of those who invented it." (On Eucharist. ii., 625.)

Dr. Blakeney says, "The declaration disclaims adoration either to the Elements or 'ANY corporal presence.' It is monstrous to hold that adoration should be rendered to Christ's body in the Elements, and yet to repudiate adoration to '*any* corporal presence.' It is a palpable contradiction between a theory and a statement, and an effort to reconcile things diametrically opposed." (Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 417.) See also a valuable note in Goode on Eucharist, ., pp. 31, 32.

† See Appendix, Note K K.

And, *secondly*, I must ask my readers simply to mark the reasons given for "No adoration." Here is no reason given of CAUTION,* lest some might unwarily be led to worship the *Elements*, instead of the BODY present under their forms. No. But One reason given IS that Christ's natural body is *in heaven* and NOT HERE. The question of *adoration* is made here to rest on the question, WHERE IS CHRIST?

* In such a caution Romanists and Ritualists might agree.

Leibnitz says—"It should be recollected that this white, small, and bread-like object, neither is Christ, nor is believed to be Christ, nor is made an object of adoration. And if it does occasionally occur that the people are not rightly instructed as to the true object of adoration in this sacrament, there is no doubt that this is a subject of deep concern to the Church, and that she desires to use every means for its correction." (System of Theology. Russell's Translation, 1850, p. 128.)

"As to adoration, Mr. Mackonochie says:—'I believe that Christ, Himself the very reality of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, out of and without the Sacrament, wherever He is, is to be adored:—but that the earthly part, as Irenæus calls it, the visible, as Augustine, is not to be adored.' I believe that we, in the mysteries, adore the Flesh of Christ, as did Ambrose, and not it, but Him, who is worshipped upon the altar."

And this is exactly what Gardiner said:—'At which time, nevertheless, that is not adored that the bodily eye seeth, but that which faith knoweth to be there invisibly present.' Page 229.

Cranmer in reply, asks:—'What moved the priests to lift up the sacrament so high over their heads." . . . *If they worshipped nothing that they saw, why did they rise up to see?*' Page 229.

'And yet, to eschew one inconvenience (that is to say, the worshipping of the Sacrament) they fell into another as evil, and worship nothing there at all. For they worship that thing (as they say) which is really and corporally and yet invisibly present under the kinds of bread and wine, which (as is before expressed and proved) *is utterly nothing*.' Page 229." (Mass in the Church of England, p. 15.)

Where is His Body? This is no question of visible or physical or organical Presence. It is simply the question of the Presence *itself*.

Observe the answer of our Church to the question of the Adoration is "No" because the answer of our Church to the question of Christ's bodily Presence is "In heaven* and not here."†

* The following words will show the views of a Roman Catholic concerning the Black Rubric: "Mr. Cobb believes in the real presence of our Lord under the species; but, how can he refrain from adoration? How can he say that the adoration would be idolatry? If the substance of the bread and wine be changed, and nothing remain but 'the natural properties,' and if he believe that our Lord is there, why does he not confess his Presence by the outward and natural act of adoration? If it be replied that adoration is refused to the 'bread and wine,' that is to the 'accidents' which remain, nothing further need be said; and we must be content with observing that nobody ever thought of adoring the accidents. . . . Now the 'black rubric' says that no adoration 'ought to be done' either

† And thus, our Church appears to me, to condemn, by implication, all teaching of the Presence of a Body after the manner of spirits.

See above, Paper No. I., pp. 18—20, and No. III., pp. 137—140. "Neque vero hic perstringendi sunt imperitorum oculi hisce subtilitatibus: existere Corpus Christi in cælo ad modum corporum; *ad modum vero spirituum* in Eucharistia. Etenim existentia sequitur necessario modum essentiæ rerum; neque proprie loquendo quidquam est existentia rerum præterquam earum essentia. . . . Quæ corpora sunt, et tamen dicuntur existere spiritualiter, dicuntur esse corpora, et tamen corpora esse negantur." (*Syntagma Thesium Theol: in Academia Salmuriensi disputatarum, sub præsidio L. Cappeli, M. Amaryldi, J. Placæi;* Part II., p. 175. Salmurii, 1665. See Pusey, "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 323—325, and Perry on "Declaration concerning Kneeling," pp. 339, 340.)

With those too who now maintain the Real Objective Presence, the question of *Adoration* is the question of the *Presence*. The answer to the question of adoration depends

to the Host, 'or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. The reason given for this refusal is that the 'bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances,' and that 'the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here.'" (Dublin Review, Jan. 1869, p. 247.)

After all that can be pleaded to the contrary, it is scarcely possible to question that the Rubric has reference to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and is intended to defend the Church of England from all *approaches to* that doctrine. Who ever laid it to the charge of the Church of England, that in bidding her children to receive the Communion on their knees, she was leading them into peril of idolatry and false doctrine far beyond anything which was taught or practised in the Church of Rome?

[Compare the following from Crakanthorp: "*Vos de præsentia Christi* CORPORALI *in Eucharistia certissimi;* cum neque ex Scripturis, neque testimonio priscorum Patrum, neque sensu, neque Ratione certi sitis, sed vanam solùm, ineptam, et impossibilem de hoc *opinionem* fovetis, et ut Idolum vestrorum cordium colitis. . . . Putemus subesse illis speciebus ipsummet Christi corpus, an ideo in illis latens Christi corpus, majis à nobis in hostiâ adorandum, quàm *ipsa Deitas Christi* latens in pane, in ligno, in lapide, in sacrificio, *in quovis homine*, est in illis adoranda? Ratio adorationis vestræ, est præsentia Deitatis, quia Christus Deus ibi latet. Cum igitur ratio eadem adorationis sit in aliis quæ dixi, cum verè ac realiter Christus Deus sit in pane, in lapide, in quovis homine, cur non procumbitis ad pedes cujusvis sacrifici, cujusvis hominis, ut Christo in illis latenti latriam exhibeatis? De præsentia Christi, quâ Deus est, in illis omnibus certissimi estis: de præsentiâ Christi, quâ homo est, in aut sub illis speciebus panis incertissimi estis. . . . Non major metus Idololatriæ aut adorandi hominem, aut lapidem in quibus latet Christus Deus quàm est motus Idololatriæ, aut adorandi hostiam in quâ latet Christi Corpus? Exime animo meo hunc scrupulum, et erit tibi gratia magna. Dic clarè cur Corpus Christi quod illic putatis præsens

on the answer to the question, "Where is Christ's body?"* And their answer to the question of the adoration is "YES," because their answer to the question "Where?" (of the presence of Christ's body) is "THERE"—*i.e.*, "there" "under the forms of bread and wine."

Hear the words of Dr. Pusey:—"The question. . . .as to

adoretis; et Deitatem Christi, quod hîc certò scitis præsentem esse, non adoretis. . . . *Præsentiam, inquis, hanc* REALEM *et* CORPORALEM *Christi nos supponimus* . . . vos falsum supponitis. *Ex* FALSO *supposito*, FALSA *religio, falsas et idolatricus cultus*, falsum quodvis consequi potest. . . . . Ex *falso* hoc supposito, *hostiam adoratis*, et adorandum dicitis." (Crakanthorp, Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, Anglo-Cath. Libra. Edit., pp. 474—476. See also passages quoted in Appendix, pp. 571—577.)]

But the Church of Rome does not mean by *corporal presence* a gross material presence—not a *sensible*, *tangible* presence—"but" either as in Dean Goode's view, "precisely that sort of presence which is imagined by the authors under review," (see Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 623, and Pusey's Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church, pp. 323, 324; also, "Is healthful Reunion impossible?" pp. 87, 88. See also Bishop St. David's Charge, 1869, pp. 111, 112, and above, Paper No. I., p. 13) or, at all events, one which differs from it in no way which (so far as I can see) can at all materially affect this question of adoration.

* An exception must be made in the case of Archdeacon Freeman, with whom the presence of Christ's crucified body does not include the presence of His Divine Person. From the Archdeacon's deductions, however, from his own peculiar doctrines, Mr. Orby Shipley declares, that "all believers in the Real Objective Presence will instinctively shrink." (The Church and the World, 1866, 3rd Edition, p. 497.) Mr. Medd in like manner disclaims this portion of the Archdeacon's teaching, (The Church and the World, pp. 325—329); and adds—"It is difficult to suppose that there is more than one believing mind in England wherein such an imagination could find place." (Page 328.)

the adoration of our Lord present in the Holy Eucharist, should be considered, apart from any notion of seeming unfitness. . . . . The simple question is—'Is our Lord and God present THERE?' If, or rather since, He is present THERE, the outward appearance is no more hindrance to us, than the dress He wore as man. St. Thomas, when he fell down and cried, 'My Lord and my God,' regarded not what raiment his Lord wore after His resurrection."*

Can, then, the ADORATION *required* by the Real Objective PRESENCE of Christ's body PRESENT THERE, *under the forms of bread and wine*, be reconciled with ADORATION *denied*, BECAUSE Christ's natural body is "IN HEAVEN, and NOT HERE;"† and BECAUSE it is "*against the* TRUTH of Christ's natural body to be at *one time* ‡ in MORE PLACES THAN ONE"?

In conclusion—(let it be said without bitterness, and let

* "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 329, 330.

† Archbishop Wake, speaking of the change of words in the Rubric, says,—"I must confess I will not undertake to say what the occasion of it was; if they thought this latter manner more free from giving offence than the other would have been, I think they did well to prefer it. Let every one entertain what notion he pleases of these things; this I have shewn is the doctrine of the Church which we all subscribe: 'That the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and NOT HERE.'" (Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 79.)

‡ A Romish writer says—"In my apprehension, either these our English divines must affirm this proposition of *one body at the same time* being in more places than one, or some other equivalent to it, to be true; or must cease to assert any *real*, *essential*, or *substantial* presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, contradistinct to the sense of the Zuinglians." (Woodhead, quoted in Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 626, note.)

it be said without offence)—I believe that the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence (whatever they may think of some isolated parts) must feel* and do feel, must acknowledge and will† acknowledge, that our Communion Service, as a whole—regarding what is absent as well as what is present—is out of tune with their most cherished views of Eucharistic doctrine.

From the bottom of my heart (God knows) I would there were not this disagreement.‡

Believing, as I believe, that the service of our Church *is* in tune with the teaching of Scripture and of the Early Church, I cannot but desire with an earnest desire that the views and opinions of all her ministers might be brought into harmony also with our Reformed Liturgy as it is.

* See Appendix, Note L L.

† See Appendix, Note M M.

‡ "The zeal which Archbishop Grindal, Bishop Ridley, Dr. Taylor, and other the holy martyrs and confessors in Queen Mary's time, expressed for this excellent liturgy before and at the time of their death, defending it by their disputations, adorning it by their practice, and sealing it with their bloods, are arguments which ought to recommend it to all the sons of the Church of England for ever, infinitely to be valued beyond all the little whispers and murmurs of argument pretended against it: and when it came out of the flame and was purified in the martyrs' fires, it became a vessel of honour, and used in the house of God in all the days of that long peace which was the effect of God's blessing, and the reward (as we humbly hope) of a holy religion: and when it was laid aside in the days of Queen Mary, it was 'to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion': they are the words of Queen Elizabeth and her grave and wise Parliament." (Bishop Jeremy Taylor: Preface to Apology for Set Forms, vol. v., pp. 237, 238. See also p. 248.)

What cause for thankfulness indeed there would be, if so it might be!

Some of those who have been drawn towards the Real Objective View may be clinging to it in the persuasion, that every other view would make the Lord's Holy Supper a void and empty thing.

But by the change, they may be sure they would lose nothing of the *reality*,* nothing of the blessedness, nothing of the fulness, nothing of the true joy of the Eucharist Feast. Nay, rather, I am persuaded they would be gainers indeed. There would be a reality of Personal Presence, a reality of perfect atonement, a reality of full possession, a reality of personal appropriation, a reality of spiritual receiving, a reality of the soul's feeding, a reality of the supply for the soul's great hunger, a reality of assurance, a reality of joy and peace in believing—such as the theory of a Corporal Presence in the Elements cannot but tend rather to mar than to give.†

May He who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think, grant us with one heart and one mouth to glorify Him through Jesus Christ our Lord!

* See Appendix, Note NN.

† "The certain truth is, ... that none give so great advantage to the *figurists*, as those that contend for *oral* manducation, and make the sacramental feast common both to worthy and unworthy." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 717.)

APPENDIX.

I have (somewhat unwillingly) reserved for an Appendix, some notes, whose length prevented their standing conveniently in the body of this Paper. These notes will be found, some of them, to trespass beyond the proper limits of my subject, which is confined to the question—"What is the real teaching of the English Church?" I have allowed myself to step out of this path, in some few of these notes, from being assured that many of my readers would be thankful to have that doctrine, which I have desired to show to be *our* doctrine, vindicated from the charge of being a departure from the faith once delivered to the saints.

Note A, see p. 432.

So it was said, as a just ground of complaint, of old:—"They tied it [*i.e.* Edward's first Book] by points and syllables, and weighed every word." (See Jeremy Taylor in Works, vol. v., p. 237.) The maintainers of the "Real Objective Presence" cannot, I think, but be sensible of the minuteness and frailty of the threads to which they are constrained to cling, when they attempt an appeal to the Communion Service.

It is admitted, indeed, by the writer of the 81st of "Tracts for the Times," that of the doctrine of the sacrifice there are but "SLIGHT *indications*." And this is attributed to the "disciplina arcani" of the Anglican Church. (See Goode's Rule of Faith, vol. ii., p. 350.) Mr. Humphry, while aiming at finding shelter for them, speaks of the doctrines of the Objective Presence, and of the Eucharist Sacrifice as left "to be found by those who seek them in *a* FEW *expressions* which are of *doubtful and disputed* interpretation." And again he says that service "contains phrases of ambiguous meaning, in which those disputed doctrines are believed to have found a refuge, like the prophets in the caves of the earth." (Principles at Stake, p. 289, 290.) One can scarcely help asking,—Did it look as if Israel's own teaching was the teaching of the prophets, when those prophets hid themselves in the dens and the caves? Does it look as if the

teaching of the Church of England is the teaching of doctrines or the Eucharist, which dare not show their heads in our Communion Service, but are to be found, if found at all, hid, as it were, in the dens and caves of the earth?

So also the Bishop of St. David's, while earnestly maintaining "liberty of thought and speech on this point" (p. 66), says, of the comparison of the work of the earthly priest with that of the offering of the Great High Priest in heaven, "we find that there is not [in our own Communion office] a word to suggest it to any mind not previously imbued with the opinion, and which did not import it into the words AGAINST *their* PLAIN *and* NATURAL *meaning*. It is not to any transaction which is taking place in the heavenly sanctuary that the Church turns our thoughts in the Prayer of Consecration but to that which took place in the Great Chamber at Jerusalem at the institution of the Lord's Supper." (Charge; 1869; p. 58, 59.)

Mr. Neal speaks of "the obscurity in which our offices involve the doctrine that the Holy Eucharist is truly and properly a propitiatory sacrifice," and calls this "our weak point." (Essays on Liturgiology, p. 5

It should be observed that these "dens and caves" in our Service seem to be of quite recent discovery. Let the reader be asked to peruse Baxter's paper "The Exceptions against the Common Prayer which I offered the Brethren when they were drawing up theirs" in "Reliquiæ Baxterianæ" (or Baxter's Narrative of his life and times pp. 308, sqq. London, 1696, and especially p. 312, also the exceptions to the Prayer Book presented at the Savoy Conference (especially Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 318—323), as well as other publications of Puritan exceptions to the Book of Common Prayer and he can hardly fail to observe how the discerning eye of the Puritan failed to detect those lurking places of the Corporal Presence which by some seem to be regarded as clearly revealing themselves under the glass of the Ritualist.

Let it be asked,—Is there anything remaining in our Communion Service so sacrificial as the following?—"See here Christ dying this holy representation! Behold the sacrificed Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world! It is His will to be thus requently crucified before our eyes." Yet this is a part of the exhortation in the Savoy Liturgy, composed by Baxter. (See Hall Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, vol. iv., p. 61.)

What Bishop Hall thought of the teaching of our Liturgy will be seen by the following quotation:—"Since, therefore, the body of Christ cannot be said to be corporally present or received by us, it must needs follow, that there is *no way* of His presence or receipt in the Sacrament *but* SPIRITUAL, which the Church of England hath laboured *so fully to express*, both in her Holy Liturgy and publickly authorized Homilies, that there is NO one POINT *of Divine truth* which she hath more punctually and plainly laid down before us." (Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 370; edit. Pratt; 1808.)

Note B, see p. 433.

As to any arguments drawn from the reverent use of the consecrated elements, see note in Paper No. II., pp. 56, 57.

As to any arguments which may be drawn from position of minister, sides of table, etc., I refer the reader to Dr. Blakeney on the Common Prayer, pp. 441—443; and Paper by Mr. Hobart Seymour in Christian Advocate; October, 1869. See also Principle at Stake, p. 286—289; and Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1866, p. 78, 79; and Charge, 1869, p. 50, 51; Fortescue's Letter to Archdeacon Freeman on Weekly Communion, p. 33, 34.

It must be remembered that what is now called "the shockingly irreverent theory of the Puritans," which "led to the constant removal of the holy table into the body of the chancel, or church" (J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, p. 160), was in truth, for very many years, not the theory only, but the enjoined practice, nay, it may be questioned whether it is not even now the only canonical practice (see Canon lxxxii.; and Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., p. 405; see also Lathbury's History of Convocation, p. 311) of the English Reformed Church (a fact not to be overlooked in interpreting the words of the rubric before consecration "standing *before* the "Table"). And those who have marked in the writings of our Reformers the indications of their *decided repugnance* to the minister's *standing with his back to the people*, will need no arguments to convince them as to what must be meant by "the north side of the table" n the Prayer Book of 1552. As to the times of Stuart and Laudian

theology and the last Review, (1) Bishop Wren's defence of himself for standing with his face to the east *only* on the ground of his *lowness of stature*, and his contending that north *part*, north *side*, and north *end*, were all one, (2) the fact that the Scotch Prayer Book of 1637 has "north *side* or *end*," (3) the drawings of Bishop Andrewes's chapel at Peterborough, and of other interiors (see Blakeney, p. 442) seem to furnish very strong historical evidence against what may be called the "*in dextro cornu*" theory. (See Canon Robertson's "How shall we Conform?" p. 136—146, and 202, 203, 398, 384, and especially p. 145 and 204; Edit. 1869.)

But (4) the following extract from L'Estrange's "Alliance of Divine Offices," (written during the last revision, and published a few years after it—see Blakeney, p. 442) seems to remove all doubt on the question:—"*Shall stand in the body of the church or in the chancel* This rubric being not explicit enough as to the proper station of the Holy Table, is illustrated by comparing the 82nd Canon with Queen Elizabeth's first injunctions and succeeding orders. In the Canon the order is, that the table shall stand where it is placed, viz., at the east end of the chancel, 'saving when the Holy Communion is to be administered, at which time the same shall be placed in so good a sort as thereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants, and the communicants also may more conveniently, and in more number communicate with the minister.' Which words are almost verbatim transcribed out of the Queen's injunctions, these only superadding:—'And after the Communion done from time to time, the same holy table to be placed where it stood before.' Nothing can be more express and demonstrative, that the table placed where the altar stood, was but seposed, set out of the way, during only the time of non-communication; and that, at the time of the Communion, it was to be removed . . . . 'As for the priest standing *at the* NORTH SIDE *of the table*, this seemeth *to* AVOID *the* priest's standing with *his face towards the east*, AS IS THE POPISH PRACTICE.' So the MS. collections of a learned man." (Edit. Oxford, pp. 244, 245. See also Blakeney's Common Prayer, pp. 499—501, and pp. 258—262.)

Possibly "the MS. collections of a learned man," referred to by 'Estrange, may be the interleaved Prayer Book of 1625, which is now in the British Museum, among the Harleian MSS., No. 7311 has inscribed on a fly leaf:—"This book is noted for the most

part by the hand of the most learned Doctor John Cosins, sometime Bishop of Durham, and was bought of Dr. White Kennett, now Bishop of Peterburgh, who found it by chance, in a private house in Peterburgh aforesaid."

It was examined by the editor of Cosin's Works, in the Anglo-Catholic Library, but not published, as being not in Cosin's handwriting, nor from his pen. (See Preface to vol. v., p. 21.) It is however, no doubt, the work of some learned Anglo-Catholic Divine.

In this book, as a note on the words "standing at the north side of the table," there is written in the margin, "to avoid the fashion of the Popish priests, who stand with their face to the east." (152.) There are other notes on the subject, on the interleaved sheet, and among them the following (153):—

"As the Primitive Church did choose to pray towards the east, to avoid the superstition of the Jews that prayed towards the west, so we do now pray towards the south, to avoid the superstition of the Papists, who use to pray towards the east. (Dr. Fulke.)

Ad cujus mensæ septentrionalem partem minister stans orabit orationem Dominicam, etc. See Common Prayer Book done into Latin, by command, and authorised; Anno 2° Eliz.

Pars septentrionalis.

North end or north side both come to one, for in all quadrilateral and quadrangular figures (and the communion table is commonly oblongum—a long square) every part of it is a side, according to the rules of art, and property of speech, etc. (Coal from Altar, 153.)"

From the book last quoted by the annotator, the following quotation is taken:—

"When he that ministereth at the altar stands at the *north end* of the same, as we use to call it, he stands, no question, at the north *side* thereof, as in propriety of speech we ought to call it." (A Coal from the Altar, 1637, p. 23.)

The following is from another publication of Heylin, with reference to the same controversy (of which a brief account may be seen in Perry's History of the Church of England, vol. i., p. 372—375; see also Lathbury, Hist. of Com. Prayer, pp. 168, 169):—

"Whether it be *pars septentrionalis*, the northern part, or *latus septentrionale*, the northern side, it must be equally displeasing to the foreign churches (for you mean only those of the Church of Rome) in

which the priest officiating is enjoined to stand *in medio altaris*, with his *back towards the people;* being a *different way from that prescribed by the minister in the Liturgy of the Church of England.*" (P. Heylyn's Antidotum Lincolniense, 1637, pp. 54, 55. See also Bishop Cosin's Note, given in Bulley's Variations, p. 145; and Archbishop Laud as quoted in the same, p. 183.)

Wheatly says, "If it be asked whether the priest is to say this prayer standing before the table, or at the *north end* of it, I answer, at the *north end* of it; for, according to the rules of grammar, the participle *standing* must refer to the verb *ordered*, and not to the verb *say*.

So that whilst the priest is ordering the bread and wine, he is to stand before the table; but when he says the prayer, he is to stand so as that he may, with the more readiness and decency, break the bread before the people, which must be on the *north side*. [The point to be observed in the above, is the convertible use of the terms, *north end* and *north side*.] For if he stood before the table, his body must hinder the people from seeing; so that he must not stand there, and consequently he must stand on the *north side;* there being, in our present rubric, no other place mentioned for performing any part of this office. In the Romish Church, indeed, they always stand before the altar during the time of the consecration, in order to prevent the people from being eye-witnesses of their operation in *working their* PRETENDED MIRACLE; and in the Greek Church they shut the chancel door, or at least draw a veil or curtain before it, I suppose, upon the same account. But our church, *that pretends* NO *such* MIRACLE, enjoins, we see, the *direct contrary* to this, by ordering the priest so to order the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency *break the bread, and take the cup into his hands,* BEFORE THE PEOPLE." (On Common Prayer; Edit. Bohn p. 302. See also Nicholls's Note on "Standing before the Table.")

That at the last revision, Bishop Cosin's suggestion of "*north side (or end),*" was not adopted (see Medd's Introduction to First Book Edward, p. xv., note; Rivingtons); can hardly be regarded as any evidence that the rubric was in future to be interpreted of the old "dextrum cornu."

Might it not equally well, or even much rather, be regarded as furnishing evidence that the Church declined to give authoritative

recognition to the "altar-wise" position of the table? It was, no doubt, for the purpose of authorizing the *new* position *(altar-wise)* that the change to "side or end," had been introduced into the Scotch Communion Service; and it was, doubtless, with a view to having the same authoritative sanction in England, that Cosin made the suggestion.

Moreover, the rejection of the insertion upon such grounds was quite of a piece with the rejection of other suggestions from the same quarter; and in full accord with the very evident determination manifested at the last Review, not to let pass unchallenged anything which seemed to bear the stamp of Laudian theology. (See below, pp. 555, 556, 558, 559.)

I add the following extract from a pamphlet by Mr. Scudamore* (Rivingtons):—"In most churches the tables would from necessity alone have been set east and west, when moved into the nave or low down in the chancel. There would not have been room between the seats to admit of their being set lengthways across the church. The great reason of it, however, was that abhorrence of 'the sacrifices of masses,' and desire to obliterate the remembrance of them from the minds of the people which had led to the substitution of a moveable wooden structure for a fixed one of stone. It was conceived—and the feeling gained strength as the Puritan leaven worked more and more—that the sight of the table set *altarwise* might recall those 'blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,' and thus imperil souls. . . . . It is evident, then, that men had what they imagined to be a good reason for the tablewise position of the altar. But as the reason for this position was the same as that for moving it at all, we cannot suppose that the revisers would secure one of these changes by a written law, and not the other. The revisers of 1552, doubtless, supposed that

* Mr. Scudamore says—"At the Restoration it was evidently still understood that the Rubric was against the altarwise position of the holy table; for in the original MS. of the Book of Common Prayer, now in the library of the House of Lords, the word *part* was at first substituted for *side*. It was cancelled, and the word *side* is written over it." ("North Side of the Table," p. 23; Rivingtons.)

It will be observed that Mr. Scudamore rejects the "*dextrum cornu*" theory as untenable (pp. 6, 7), and adduces evidence as to the general practice (before Laud's time) of placing the table not *altarwise* but *tablewise* (pp. 10—17), as well as of the enjoined practice of removing the table at time of Communion (pp. 8, 9).

Mr. Scudamore, however, contends that "*side*" cannot mean "end" (pp. 18—22), and relies much on the *Answer* of the Bishops (*not* the Revisers) at the Savoy Conference, as to the fitness that in prayer "they should all turn another way." (Pages 31, 32. See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 353.)

they had done both; and the revisers of 1559 and 1604 must have given them credit for it, or we should have heard of a desire at least to supply what to the Puritanism of that age must have appeared a very serious defect. But the only written law which bears on the subject is the order occurring in the same Rubric as that for moving the table, that the priest shall 'stand at the north *side*' of it. This was sufficient, however, if the word *side* were understood in its strict and proper sense. It made it necessary to give the table a north *side*, which could only be done by setting it east and west. That the Rubric was meant to be thus understood, we might infer from the two facts: (1) That only so could the altar-like appearance, so offensive to the then prevailing party, be quite done away; and (2) That the tables were everywhere so set—*i.e.*, with one *side*, properly so-called, towards the north, from the first publication of the Rubric." (Scudamore's "North Side of the Table," pp. 10, 11, 12.)

Note C, see p. 434.

I have thought this (as being more simple) preferable to saying that "holy sacrament" is to be understood as signifying "the outward and visible signs in their consecrated relationship to Christ's institution, and His presence of grace and power in the ordinance."

Our Reformers and their successors, with all their distinct repudiation of the Corporal Presence, did not hesitate sometimes to speak of the *res sacramenti* as being, *in a certain sense*, in the *Sacramentum*, by reason of this relationship: not, of course, *in* the outward sign, as being (in any sense) *contained in* it: not, of course, *in* it viewed simply in itself, but *in* it as viewed in connexion with the promise contained in the Saviour's institution, which connexion alone gives it a true title to the name of *Sacrament; in* it (in a word) viewed ONLY *as the ordinance of Christ.*

The reader may be asked to mark specially the following words of Bishop Reynolds, who was himself on the Commission of the Savoy Conference (on the Presbyterian side) and was, moreover, the composer (in all probability) of our General Thanksgiving: "As, by faith, we have the evidence,—so, by the Sacrament, we have the *presence* of things farthest *distant* and *absent* from us. . . . . In this sacrament we do most willingly acknowledge a *real*, true, and perfect presence of Christ,—not *in*, with or under the elements, considered *absolutely*

in themselves, but with that *relative* HABITUDE *and* RESPECT which they have unto *the immediate use*, whereunto they are *consecrated*." (Works, vol. iii., p. 68; Edit. 1826.)

Cranmer says—"All that love and believe Christ himself, let them not think that Christ is corporally in the bread. . . . . For He is not in it, neither spiritually, as He is in man, nor corporally, as He is in heaven, but *only sacramentally*, as a thing may be said to be IN *the figure*, whereby it is signified." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 238.)

Again, Cranmer writes—

"And therefore you gather of my sayings unjustly, that Christ is indeed absent; for I say (according to God's Word and the doctrine of the old writers), that Christ is present in His Sacraments, as they teach also that He is present in His Word, when He worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers; by which manner of speech it is not meant that Christ is corporally present in the voice or sound of the speaker (which sound perisheth as soon as the words be spoken), but this speech meaneth that He worketh with His Word, using the voice of the speaker as His instrument to work by, as He useth also His Sacraments, *whereby He worketh, and therefore is said to be present in them*." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 11. Compare Preface to Edit. 1551.)

The whole force of the objection seems to rest on, the misconception, that, *because* in our view the "*sacramentum*" may be separated from the "*res sacramenti*," *therefore*, the word "*sacrament*" cannot in our view be regarded as *connoting* anything beyond what is outward and visible. Whereas Beza is but expressing the true view of our Reformers when he bids us see in the sacraments the signs and pledges of Christ's body and blood, and "that in *such sort* that the same thing which is signified is offered to us to be received spiritually." (See Fulke: "Defence of Translation," p. 502.)

Hooker says that sacraments "*consist altogether in* RELATION TO some such gift or grace supernatural as only God can bestow." (Edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 219.)

Ursinus says—"Hæ duæ res, nempe signum et res signata, uniuntur in hoc sacramento, non copulatione aliqua physica . . . sed significatione, obsignatione, et exhibitione unius per alteram, hoc est *unione sacramentali*, cujus nexus est hæc promissio pani addita, postulans fidem utentium. Unde patet, eas res in usu legitimo semper conjunctim

exhiberi et percipi, sed non sine fide promissionis, intuente et apprehendente rem promissam *in sacramento præsentem:* NON *tamen præsentem vel inclusam in signo, ut in vasculo,* sed præsentem in promissione, quæ est pars potior, et anima sacramenti. Inepti enim sunt qui clamant, corpus Christi non posse esse *in sacramento præsens*, nisi sit *in pane vel sub pane.* Quasi vero solus panis absque promissione sit sacramentum aut præcipua pars sacramenti." (Ursinus, Explicatio Catechet, in Works, vol. i.; p. 266; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

Again, Ursinus says—"Addet [Augustinus] sic infidelem habere integrum sacramentum, sicut habet integrum Evangelium, symbolum, verbum Dei, hoc est, ex parte Dei, offerentis in verbo et sacramentis res una cum signis, et jubentis utrumque simul accipi: sed non ex parte infidelium, qui verba audientes, et symbola videntes et usurpantes, ea quæ utrisque significantur, et promittuntur credentibus, fide non accipiunt. Non quidem possunt impii sua infidelitate quicquam de autoritate et veritate verborum et sacramentorum divinorum detrahere; sed possunt tamen se ipsos spoliare bonis cœlestibus, quæ in verbo et sacramento ipsis a Deo offeruntur." (*Commonefact: Chytræi Consideratio,* in Works, vol. ii., p. 1279; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

So Calvin also writes (and he repeatedly declares the same thing)—"Objicitur sacramentorum efficaciam non pendere ex dignitate hominum. . . . . *Fateor*, et ideo diserte addo, non *minus malis quam bonis* OFFERRI *Christi Corpus:* quod ad vim sacramenti et Dei finem satis est . . . . quod respuunt, illud *nihil imminuit vel mutat* de sacramenti natura." (On 1 Cor. xi. 27. See also Calvin's Works, Edit. Amsterdam, 1667, vol. viii., pp. 656, 666, 674, 692, 698, 744; vol. ix., pp. 256, 266.)

To just the same effect Bishop Field writes—"This presence doth consist in this, that so often as the bread and wine in the holy sacrament are offered to any communicant, at the same instant the body and blood of Christ do also present themselves truly to the soul of the person; as, in the word, Christ is truly offered to those that hear it; and howbeit the hallowed bread and wine be never separated from the things which they do seal and signify, but do always *offer* them by virtue of that promise which they do *seal* and *confirm;* yet God, *to* NONE *but believers*, doth inwardly perform that which outwardly he offereth." (Parasceve Paschæ, pp. 135, 136. See also pp. 120, 114, 116; Edit. 1624.)

And just this, in Bishop Field's view, is the teaching of our Catechism. He says—"As in this Supper both the body and blood of Christ be *offered* unto us, for our *ghostly refection*: so also both the one and the other are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received of the *faithful* in the Lord's Supper; as our Church teacheth in the Catechism." (Parasceve Paschæ, pp. 138, 139; 1624.)

Here, I think, will be found sufficient answer to Dr. Pusey's argument in "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church." (Pages 167, 168.)

It may be observed, that upon words of a subsequent exhortation, Bishop Hall builds an argument to show how clearly our Church teaches *spiritual* reception only. "What terms," he asks, "can be more express? It is bread and wine which we come to receive; that bread and wine is sacramental. It is our heart, wherewith we receive that Sacrament; it is our faith, whereby we worthily receive. This receipt and manducation of the flesh of Christ is *spiritually** done." And again he argues (still more forcibly) from later words—"If, therefore, we shall look upon and take these sacred elements as

* The words of the exhortation—"As the benefit is great, if with a truly penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament; (*for* THEN *we spiritually eat* the flesh of Christ.....)" etc.—were both in the first and second Book of Edward VI. No doubt they *may* be read so as to harmonize well with a Romish or Lutheran sense. But only on the supposition of there being two *manners* of eating the *res sacramenti*—one *corporal* (which may be without benefit), the other *spiritual* (with benefit). And this supposition will be acknowledged, I think, by most persons to be excluded, if not (as it seems to me) by the whole structure of our Communion Service, yet certainly by the declaration of our Article, that the body of Christ is eaten "*only* after a heavenly and *spiritual* manner." (See Ursinus, Works, vol. ii., pp. 1229, 1230.)

Unless we would make our Prayer Book teach that which would be contradiction in terms of our Article, the words "*then* we spiritually eat" must tell of the *only real* eating; and the word "spiritually" must be understood, not at all as implying another eating *not spiritual*, but as introduced to guard against the supposition that in the *eating* mentioned is meant any oral manducation.

And thus read, the teaching of the exhortation certainly implies, that without a true penitent heart and lively faith we do *not really* eat the flesh of Christ nor drink His blood.

Compare Cranmer:—"As for wicked members of the devil, they eat the sacramental bread and drink the sacramental wine, but they do not *spiritually* eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood, but they eat and drink their own damnation." (On Lord's Supper, p. 47. See "Sequal to Kiss of Peace," pp. 344, 345.)

But while I think it not unimportant that it should be clearly seen that this is the true and only admissible sense of the words of the exhortation, I would caution my readers against laying undue weight on such arguments.

the pledges of our Saviour's love to us, and remembrances of His death for us, we shall not need, neither indeed shall we require, by the judgment of our Church, to set any other value on them." (Works, vol. ix., p. 371; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

Note D, see p. 434.

Since writing the above, I have met with a small pamphlet entitled "Why I left the Church of England; by Edward Husband;" from which it appears clearly that the writer from whom I have quoted in the text is now a member of the Romish Church. I have not thought it necessary to alter what I have written; but I gather from the following extracts that Mr. Husband must have completely altered his views of our Eucharistic Service, and of the comparative consistency with which it is ministered by those who support and those who oppose the principles of our Reformation. I trust they may assist my readers to form their own opinion on the same subject.

"As an instance of my early Roman bias, I give the following example. When I was at College, preparing for Anglican orders, I was nearly dismissed by the Principal, on account of an article which I wrote for a magazine, upon the subject of 'Eucharistic Adoration.' In a pamphlet which the Principal published in answer to my statements, I find that one point which I strove to prove was this: that 'Transubstantiation was more Scriptural than Zwingli's doctrine.' This was in the year 1865. I find that then my belief in reference to the doctrine of the Real Presence was substantially the same as it is now; for in my College article are these words: '*At the Consecration the Holy Spirit of God descends upon the Altar, and the elements become the real, natural, corporal Body, and the Blood of Christ.*' Still, at that time I had no idea of ever leaving the Anglican Church." (Page 6.)

"I am writing from memory, and consequently under correction, but I do not think that in the twelve 'Catholic Tracts' which I published as an Anglican clergyman, there was doctrine contrary to the belief

of the Holy Catholic Church. I merely state this by way of example, and to show how near an Anglican may come to Catholicism without being actually a Catholic. The great change I felt was, that what before had been all doubt and uncertainty, was now changed into certainty; what before was forced, now became natural; what before I had believed and taught *against* authority, I now believed by the command and with the express authority of my Church; what before was shadow and phantom, was now substantial reality. *I am bound with thankfulness to acknowledge that it was 'Ritualism' that led me to Rome. This experience is being confirmed daily by the numbers who are seeking admission into the Fold. It is* IN THIS WAY *that 'Ritualism' is doing good.*" (Pages 23, 24.)

"I had in my own house a private Oratory, in which I had what I believed at one time to be the Reserved Sacrament. When I had come to a conclusion in my own mind, that what I had reserved there was not the Blessed Sacrament, I determined at once to remove it. But when I entered the Oratory for this purpose, my courage failed me. There was the dim red light, which in Catholic Churches betokens the presence of the Most Blessed Sacrament, burning as religiously as ever; and a feeling came across me, that I was going to commit an irretrievable act—viz., setting my seal to the belief for ever, as far at my own soul was concerned, that the Church of England was destitute of Sacraments. I felt I could not remove it that day; and when I went the second day on the same errand, the light of the Sanctuary lamp disarmed me once more, and I left the Oratory again with my mission unfulfilled. The following morning found me determined in my resolution to remove that day what I could not believe in my heart to be the Body and Blood of the Lord. With this resolve I went hastily into the room. As soon as I entered its threshold I started. The lamp had gone out! I had it immediately examined, and found it had not gone out for want of oil. I knew it was to tell me, that that which it had been burning before was not the Blessed Sacrament. So I readily accepted the omen; reverently consumed the bread and wine: after which the lamp was never again lighted.

Although I had now given notice of my intention to resign my curacy, circumstances prevented me from ceasing to take duty in the Church of England; which I continued, with a heavy heart, for

awhile to do, with the exception of celebrating at the Anglican 'Office of Holy Communion.' It was my practice before commencing a service to use privately a prayer to this effect,—'That I might be forgiven for taking part in a service which I doubted was Catholic.'" (Pages 19—21.)

[P.S.—If the newspapers are right, Mr. Husband has since *left* the Romish Church.]

Note E, p. 435.

By a reference to the same Directory (Neal's History of Puritans, Appendix, vol. iii., p. 537) may be simply answered everything like an argument which may be built upon the *manual* directions, and "the fact of their reintroduction after a withdrawal of a century." (See Sequel to Kiss of Peace, pp. 315-16, and J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, p. 584: also Bulley's Variations, Preface, p. xxviii.) The manual directions as added at the last Review will be found (I think) more like those of the Assembly's Directory, than like those of the first Book of Edward VI. [See also J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, pp. 206, 207, where the Directory is called "this presumptuous and irreverent parody of the Liturgy," and it is said "When the children asked for bread this was the stone which was provided for them."] Indeed the Puritan Divines had excepted, before the last review, "We conceive that the manner of the consecrating of the Elements is not here explicit and distinct enough, and the minister's *breaking of the bread* is not so much as mentioned." (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 321.)

And it will be found set down among "*the concessions*" which, after the Savoy Conference, the Bishops expressed themselves as willing to make—"10. That the manner of consecrating the elements may be made more explicit and express, and to that purpose those words be put into the rubrics, 'Then shall he put his hand upon the bread and break it,' 'then shall he put his hand unto the cup.'" (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 363.)

Wheatly says, after speaking of the objections of Bucer—"The

taking of the bread and the cup into the hands, has indeed since been restored, viz., first to the Scotch Liturgy, and then to our own, *even* AT THE REQUEST *of the Presbyterians*, at the last review. But the signing of them with the cross [which was in first Book of Edward] has ever since been discontinued: though I do not know that there is an ancient Liturgy in being, but what shews that this sign was always made use of in some part or other of the office of Communion." (On Common Prayer. Edit. Bohn, p. 298. See Goulburn on the Holy Communion, pp. 281, 282, and Maskell's Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England. Pref., pp. 64, 65. Bilson's True Difference, pp. 658—661. Edit. 1585.)

Bingham says that "in consecrating the Eucharist, they [the ancients] always brake the bread, in conformity to our Saviour's example, to represent His Passion and Crucifixion." (Antiquities, Book xv., chap. xxxv., vol. v., p. 151. See Palmer's Origines Liturgicæ, vol. ii., pp. 144, 145.) The Westminster Confession declares, "The Lord Jesus hath, in this ordinance, appointed His ministers to declare His word of Institution to the People; to pray, and bless the Elements of Bread and Wine, and thereby to set them apart from a Common to an Holy Use; and to Take, and Break the Bread, to take the Cup, etc." (Chap. xxix. 3. Compare the Larger Catechism, pp. 131, 132.) The Middleburgh Prayer Book directs the minister "to break the bread and deliver it to the people." (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 195.) And Baxter's Service presented at the Savoy Conference orders, "Let the minister take the Bread, and break it in the sight of the people." (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 202, and Hall's Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, vol. iv., p. 70. See also Zuingle's Formula in Gerdes, Hist. Reform., vol. i., p. 243.)

Ursinus says*—"Quod fractio panis non sit accidentaria quædam circumstantia . . . . sed pars ceremoniarum a Christo institutarum, et præceptarum, perspicue testantur ipsa Evangelistarum verba." (Works, vol. ii., p. 47; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612. But see the whole chapter "De fractione panis in Cœna Domini;" also vol. ii., pp. 610, 660, 1225. See also Chamier: "Pan. Cath.," tom. iv., p. 183.)

* Elsewhere Ursinus gives three reasons why the *breaking of the bread* should be restored. The reasons are—"1. Ob mandatum Christi. 2. Propter usum nostrum et consolationem. . . . . 3. Propter παιδείαν rudiorum ut videlicet plebs hoc pacto reducatur ab idololatria. . . . . " (Vol. ii., p. 51.)

"Nulla Liturgica est, in qua talis ritus [fractio] non præscribatur, et quamvis diversis, modis fiat, summam semper habet Eucharistiæ reverentiam." (Renaudot: Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio, tom. i., Dissertatio, p. xx.; Frankfort, 1847. See also especially L'Aroque's History of Eucharist, pp. 106—109; Walker's Translation, 1684. And Hospinian: Historia Sacrament., part i., lib. v., cap. v; in Works, vol. iii., pp. 395—398; Geneva, 1681. See also vol. iv., pp. 20, 21. See also Bulley's Variations, pp. 180, 181.)

Note F, p. 436.

See Appendix to Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii., p. 537, also, Blakeney on Common Prayer, p. 428. I trust it will be seen that here is sufficient answer to the arguments of Dr. Pusey in "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 172—180. In 1552 the words, "The body," etc., were omitted, and the Elements delivered with only "Take and eat this, in remembrance," etc.

But it has been justly observed:—"This alteration was wisely modified in 1559, when the form of 1548-9 was restored and prefixed to that of 1552. But it is obvious that the ancient form does not actually assert anything as to the Real Presence, and is open to widely different interpretations. It may be understood to mean The body of our Lord, etc., which is present in this bread, and The body of our Lord, etc., of which this bread is the sign or sacrament; and each person may put upon it the meaning which he thinks the more consistent with the context, or with the general teaching of the Communion Service. The words, as used in the unreformed Church, would doubtless be taken to imply a local presence, and perhaps even a change of substance. As they stand in our Service, they must take their colour from their surroundings, among which the sentence immediately following, Take and eat this in remembrance, etc., is one of the most significant." (Principles at Stake, p. 274.)

The following is from a Roman Catholic writer:—"The ancient words were restored in 1559, but with the Zuinglian form added to them. And as the ancient words are not so distinct but that they

may be explained away, the revisers of 1559, followed by those of 1662, have allowed without repudiation the Zuinglian sense to be put upon the Catholic form." (Canon Estcourt upon the Catholic Teaching of the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 49, 50.)

"The customary, though not prescribed, form in England for delivery to communicants seems to have been 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.' This was retained by our Reformers with the important addition of the clause 'which was given for thee' by which the thoughts *are directed to dwell on* THE BODY SLAIN ON THE CROSS, *not* on the *bread which is received*, as the source of salvation for body and soul." Humphry's "Student's Common Prayer," pp. 140, 141.)

"The effect of the whole form, as we have it now, is to *carry the mind back to the* SACRIFICE ON THE CROSS, in faithful and thankful remembrance of which we are exhorted to eat and drink." (Ibid, p. 123.) See also "Prayer Book interleaved." (Rivingtons) p. 174.

The following paraphrase of Dr. Nicholls will commend itself, I think, as bringing out a perfectly natural meaning of the words:— 'O my dear Christian Brother, May the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which this Bread that I here bring unto thee does represent, and verily exhibit to thee, if thou comest with a true faith and worthy Disposition, to receive it; May this Body so exhibited, and which our blessed Lord gave up to be sacrificed for us, be a Spiritual Preservative to thee, and bring with it such Grace and Influence as may incline thee to live with that Goodness and Piety, as that thou mayst by God's Grace and Favour, attain everlasting Happiness. Therefore do thou take from me this* consecrated Bread, and eat it, as a Token that thou dost gratefully remember that Christ died to save thee, and do thou thankfully feed on Him in thy heart by Faith." See also Bishop Jeremy Taylor. Preface to Apology to set forms, Vol. v., p. 246; and Bulley's Variations, pp. 206, 209.)

* So Bishop Cosin, "As he [the Priest delivers the sacred elements to any one, he says in an audible voice, 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life, take and eat *this* [SACRAMENT] in remembrance, etc." (Religion of the Church of England, Edit. Meyrick, Rivingtons, p. 44.) See also the answer of the Bishops at the Savoy Conference, "It is most convenient that the minister deliver *the bread and wine* into every particular communicant's hand, etc." (See above, Paper No. VI, pp. 391, 392.)

On the desire of Ritualists to omit the latter clause in the form of administration, see Rivington's Protest, p. 5.

Bishop Hall says of the words of delivery, "No gloss in the world can make the words more full and perspicuous. So do we, in remembrance of Christ's death, take and eat the sacramental bread with our mouths, as that our hearts do feed upon the body of Christ by our faith. And what is this feeding upon Christ but a comfortable application of Christ and His benefits to our souls? Which is, as the prayer next following expresses it, then do we feed on Christ when by the blessed 'merits and death' of our Blessed Saviour 'and through faith in His blood,' we do 'obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion,' and are 'fulfilled with His grace and heavenly benediction.'" (Works: vol. ix., p. 372. Edit Pratt, 1808.)

Note G, see p. 437.

The prayer is thus paraphrased by Dr. Nicholls:—"Grant us therefore, out of this Thy commiseration and goodness, that we may receive such benefit by the spiritual eating and drinking of His body and blood, that our bodies may be purified from all fleshly sins by the one, and our souls washed from all stains of guilt by the other; and that we may for ever be joined with Him in a spiritual union. Amen."*

* Similar teaching to that contained in this prayer will be found abundantly in the writings of Reformed theologians. The following is from a Reformed Declaration of Faith:—"Patet, non solam virtutem, efficaciam, operationem, aut beneficia Christi nobis præsentari et communicari, sed imprimis ipsam substantiam corporis et sanguinis Christi seu ipsam illam Victimam, quæ pro mundi vita data est, et in cruce mactata, ut per fidelem hujus Victimæ Communionem, et cum Christo ipso unionem, consequentes esiam meritorium et beneficiorum, sacrificio ejus partorum, participes simus, et sicut ipse in nobis, ita nos in ipso maneamus. Et quidem, non tantum, quoad animam, sed etiam quoad corpus nostrum. Etsi enim, ut Ore Corporis Rem terrenam, ita fide cordis ceu organo proprio, rem cœlestem acceptamus, seuundum veterem illum Versiculum 'Ventrem, quod terimus, Mentem, quod credimus, intrat:' tamen fide illa mediante non solum Animæ, sed ipsa corpora nostra, Christi corpori, per ejusdem Spiritum, ad spem resurrectionis et vitæ æternæ inseruntur et uniuntur, ut simus caro de carne ejus et os de ossibus ejus, adeoque unum cum ipso corpus mysticum, quod Apostolus merit

Waterland says of this prayer,—"In our public Service we pray that 'our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood! The propositions touched under these words are several:—1. That our bodies are the *temple* of the Holy Ghost. 2. That sin *defileth* them. 3. That the *sacrifice* of Christ, removing *guilt* (other due circumstances supposed), makes them *clean*. 4. That there is an *application* of that sacrifice made in the Eucharist. 5. That therefore such application ought to be prayed for. So much for the *body*. The like, with a little change, may be understood also of the *soul*: and the conclusion from both parts is, that *guilt* is washed away in the Sacrament, *duly* administered and *duly* received, both from *body* and *soul*; which in other words amounteth to this: that *remission of sins* is conferred by the Eucharist to all *worthy* receivers." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 655. See also Willet's Synopsis Papismi, vol. viii., pp. 388, 389. Edit. 1852.)

Bishop Cosin says of this prayer,—"In the first edition of King Edward VI.'s Liturgy, this was used after the consecration of the Elements, and before the receiving of them. The reason why it was afterwards (and now is) otherways ordered, seems to have been taken at those words (*after consecration*) contained in this prayer—*So to eat the flesh*, etc.: which some men thought might otherwise have im-

dixit mysterium magnum esse." (*Declaratio Thoruniensis*, 1645, in Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum*, pp. 682, 683.)

The only objection made to this Prayer at the Savoy Conference was, that it seemed "to give a greater efficacy to the blood than to the body of Christ." (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 320.) Bucer specially commends it. (Script. Angl., p. 473.)

Willet says—"There is the same spiritual efficacy of Christ's body and blood, yet a divers sacramental use and application." (Synopsis Papismi, vol. viii., p. 389. See also pp. 374, sqq.)

"Potest sanguine anima intelligi quod anima sit sanguis." (Notes in Harleian MS., No. 7311, p. 165. See above, p. 481. See also Horneck's "Crucified Jesus," p. 181; 1727.)

Bishop Field quotes from St. Ambrose—"That which we do receive is of power to defend both our body and soul. Because the flesh of Christ is offered for the health and salvation of our body, and His blood for our souls." And he adds—"Let it be granted that we do, under either kind, receive whole Christ, with all His benefits; yet saith that holy Father, if it should be received in one kind alone, it should signify that it were powerful to defend but one only part of man (viz., either the *soul* or the *body*), and not both of them together. And it may be that the worthies of our Church had some relation to those reasons of St. Ambrose, or some such like, in that prayer which goeth immediately before consecration in our Communion Book; where we pray . . . . . that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood." (Paraseeve Paschæ, pp. 177, 178; Edit, 1624.)

ported transubstantiation." And he adds: "For the same purpose wer the words in the Form of Consecration altered from *fiat nobis corpi et sanguis Domini*, to what they now are. In like sort, because th very term of *offering and sacrifice*, though well used of old, and in far different meaning from that sense wherein the Papists used then seemed nevertheless to sound their meaning, and therefore to giv offence, it is altered into another expression of *Christ's precious deat* only." (In Nicholl's Additional Notes, p. 45. See also p. 53. Se also Cosin's Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. v., pp. 470, 471.)

We may take as a comment on this prayer the words of ou Homily:—"The unbelieving and faithless cannot feed upon tha precious body. . . . . Wherefore let us prove and try ourselve unfeignedly, without flattering ourselves, whether we be plants o the fruitful olive, living branches of the true vine, members indee of Christ's mystical body: whether God hath purified our hearts b faith, to the sincere acknowledging of His Gospel, and embracing o His mercies in Christ Jesus, so THAT at this His table we receiv NOT ONLY the *outward Sacrament*, but the SPIRITUAL THING also; no the *figure*, but the TRUTH; not the *shadow* only, but the BODY; not t *death*, but to LIFE; not to *destruction*, but to SALVATION." (Page 40(See Dr. Heurtley's "Remarks on Declaration," p. 19.)

The argument of the Ritualists might be applied with equal forc to the words of the Westminster Directory: "So (to) feed upon Hir that He may be one with us, and we with Him." (See Hall, Reliquia Liturgicæ, vol. iii., p. 56.) And to the words of Bishop Hall: "Th flesh is meat indeed. . . . . Oh, that I may so eat of this bread, tha I may live for ever!" (Works, vol. vii., p. 512; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

Note H, see p. 442.

This does not look at all as if Cranmer in this matter was "weal and vacillating," (see Medd's Introduction to Walton's "First Book of Edward VI., p. xiii.); or as if our English Reformers were weakly persuaded by foreign influence to do what was against their own convictions.

Dr. Cardwell writes:—"It cannot indeed be doubted, that the many learned foreigners who were at this time settled and actively employed in England, and were almost without exception in favour of more extensive changes, exerted an important influence on public opinion: but it is also certain that many of the English Reformers, and the most active and considerable among the commissioners themselves, were desirous of a greater degree of simplicity, both in faith and worship. Cox and Taylor, who were probably the working members of the commission, appear to have looked upon the oblation of the Eucharist as consisting merely of prayer, thanksgiving, and the remembrance of our Saviour's passion. Ridley, who entertained higher conceptions of its nature, had yet been the first, even before the Order of Council had been issued, to remove the ancient altars, and to place tables in their stead. And Cranmer, with the convictions he expressed in his Defence of the Sacrament and his Answer to Gardiner, could not have wished to retain the prayers of consecration and oblation, or to convey the impression which they were intended to make of a real unbloody sacrifice." (Cardwell: Preface to Liturgies of Edward, xxviii.—xxx.)

It must not be supposed that Ridley was at all behind Cranmer and other members of the Commission in opposition to and repudiation of any such sacrificial character in the Eucharist as forms a part of the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. (See Works, P. S. Edit., pp. 206—212; and Bulley's Variations, pp. 198, 199.)

Bishop Harold Brown says:—"The chief assistant to Cranmer .... in the translations and revisions of the Liturgy, was unquestionably his great friend and counsellor Ridley. . . . . Ridley showed the greatest zeal to induce conformity, both to it [the First], and also to the Second Service Book, which was far more extensively reformed. And indeed throughout, Cranmer and he appear to have walked in the same course, and acted on the same principles. It is of consequence to remember these facts. For, if Cranmer and Ridley were the chief compilers both of the Prayer Book and of the Articles; although the Church is in no degree bound by their private opinions, yet, when there is a difficulty in understanding a clause either in the Articles or the Liturgy, which are the two standards of authority as regards the doctrines of the English Church, it cannot but be desirable to elucidate such difficulties by appealing to the writings, and other-

wise expressed opinions of these two reformers. It is true, both Liturgy and Articles have been altered since their time. Yet by far the larger portion of both remains, just as they left them." (Introd to Exposition of Articles, p. 7.)

Soames says, "This important business was entrusted, under royal authority, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Ely, and others of the episcopal order. *When these prelates met*, they determined, that many alterations should be made." (History of Reformation, vol. III., p. 594. See Letter of Peter Martyr there quoted in note d. Soames, however, attributes the determination of the prelates to necessity, "for the sake of giving general satisfaction." (See p. 595.)

"None of the learned and pious Divines of our Church, at that time, expressed any Dissatisfaction concerning them [*i.e.* the alterations in 1552] or murmured against the omission of those usages which the worthy Compilers of our Liturgy thought it expedient and requisite, to discharge. But of late great clamours have been made against this second Liturgy. . . . The Pretence is, that this Review was made to humour Calvin, Bucer, and Peter Martyr; that the Liturgy was modelled according to their Fancy; its Beauty and Order defaced, and the most primitive and catholic usages expunged to gratify the unreasonable importunity of those Foreigners. . . . As if our Bishops and Clergy were men of such abandon'd Consciences so void of all sense of Religion, as to prefer the gratifying the unreasonable Prejudices of two or three Men, of less learning and Reputation than themselves, to Christ's own Institution and the due Administration of his Sacraments; and as if, after their many grievous accusations against the Church of Rome, for daring to mutilate Christ's Institution, by taking away the Cup from the Laity they themselves would so far incur the same condemnation, as sacrilegiously to take away one half of the instituted Matter of that Cup." . . . (Downes's Appendix prefixed to Sparrow's "Rationale" 1722, pp. 171, 172.)

That the principle upon which Reformers acted in asking the judgment of Bucer and P. Martyr was not one of servile surrender of themselves to be guided by foreign judgments, but of earnest desire to profit by the counsel of men esteemed among them, is evident from the fact, that, though Bucer and Martyr knew some alterations

were determined on, they were kept in ignorance what they were; and P. Martyr durst not presume to ask Cranmer what would be done.* (See Downes's Appendix prefixed to Sparrow's Rationale, p. 176. Collier's Eccl. Hist., vol. v., p. 434. Archbishop Lawrence's Bampton Lectures, pp. 246, 247.)

"If some particulars were altered agreeable to their judgment, it was, because our Bishops thought the reasons, which they gave, for making those alterations, conclusive and convincing: in other things, where their reasons had less force, they were as freely rejected." . . . (Downes's Appendix, prefixed to Sparrow's Rationale, 1722, p. 176.)

Soames says, "Most of the changes had, indeed, most probably, been debated before any notice was taken of the foreign professors, and the Archbishop wisely abstained from communicating to Martyr a single particular of what had passed between himself and his brethren. His object in applying to the learned strangers appears to have been no other, than to obtain the fullest information before he acted. Upon the principle of coming thus prepared for the consideration of every question submitted to him, he had proceeded through all the stages of his public life, and to this cautious habit is owing the solidity of the decisions which emanated ultimately from him." (History of Reformation, vol. III., p. 596.) "These alterations were made after most mature deliberation, the new book not being ready for use until more than twelve months had elapsed from the time in which preparations were first made for reviewing it." (Ibid, p. 606.)

The true key then to the influence exercised by these men may be said to be set before us in words written by Cranmer, with reference, apparently, to what had just been cast in his teeth by Gardiner con-

* Gloucester Ridley writes, "A review was therefore determined: many things were thought proper to be altered. Bucer and Martyr were desired to give their opinions also. . . . . But they had no further hand in the alterations than in delivering their censures, separately, to the Archbishop. . . . . And as the Reviewers were *not moved* by them, but by some members of the Convocation; so, many alterations were agreed on before those Professors were consulted. . . . The persons engaged in this review are reasonably supposed to be the same who first compiled it; but chiefly the Archbishop and the Bishop of London. The first was very solicitous in procuring what helps he could to make it as perfect as might be; and the latter was most earnest in recommending it, as if it has been a thing he had well weighed and considered, which intimates their great concern in it." (Life of Ridley, pp. 333, 334, London, 1763.)

cerning Bucer, "I, having exercised myself in the study of Scripture and divinity from my youth, (whereof I give most hearty lauds and thanks to God,) have learned now to *go alone*, and do examine, judge, and write all such weighty matters *myself;* although, I thank God, I am neither so arrogant nor so wilful, that I will *refuse* the *good advice*, counsel, and admonition of *any man*, be he man or master, friend or foe." (On Lord's Supper, p. 224.) See also Trevor's "Sacrifice and Participation," 227—230.

The following account from the pen of Le Bas cannot fairly, I think, be charged with misrepresentation;—"Whatever might be his veneration for the name of Calvin, nothing was further from the Archbishop's mind than the thought of bowing down before the supremacy of Geneva. He was, however, quite ready to receive any reasonable suggestions which might be offered for the improvement of the devotional Formularies; and most assuredly he never imagined that the '*aid of the Holy Spirit*' had been vouchsafed in such measure to the original labourers in the work, as to supersede all possible necessity for future correction. He proceeded, however, in this matter with his usual circumspection. One of his first steps was to consult Peter Martyr, and Martin Bucer, the great theological authorities of Oxford and Cambridge. With this view, he had procured a translation of the book into Latin, executed by Alexander Aless, chiefly for the accommodation of Bucer, who was but little acquainted with the English language. He then told them, that he was desirous of their frank opinion relative to the alterations that might be expedient; adding, that the Convocation had already resolved that certain changes should be effected. But, wishing to be in possession of their unbiassed judgment, and having no intention to raise them to the dignity of arbitrators,—he cautiously abstained from specifying to them any one of the corrections which that Body had in contemplation. This application drew from Martin Bucer a copious list of animadversions; the whole of which were sanctioned by the concurrence of Peter Martyr. The review of the book was then completed by the Archbishop himself, assisted principally by Ridley and Cox. The suggestions of the two foreign divines were, in some instances, adopted, and in others, rejected; and the result of all these labours was the Book of Common Prayer, reduced very nearly to the precise form in which it appears at the present day." (Le Bas, Life of Cranmer, vol. II., pp. 73, 74.)

In the Biography of Jewel, which follows Overall's Preface, in the Edition of Jewel's Works of 1609, it is said : "This Blessed Prince (Edward VI.) in true zeal towards the House of God, sent for the chiefest builders and most renowned carvers and workmen from all parts of the Christian reformed world, to repair, adorn and beautify the Church of God in England. Among others Peter Martyr, as a spiritual Bazaleel was by his Majesty appointed Professor of Divinity at Oxford." (Compare Archbishop Parker as quoted in Goode's "Brotherly Communion," p. 9.)

"Annis quinto et sexto ejusdem Regis [Edw. VI.] emissum est aliud *senatus consultum*, de *explanendo* et *perficiendo* publicarum precum libro; liberque ita explanatus statuto annexus est, cum formula consecrandi ministros adjuncta. . . . Primo Mariæ, hac lege antiquata, liber ipse disparuit, qui tamen, in solio fulgente Elizabetha, pristinam dignitatem et splendorem recuperavit. . . . . Vos semper de authoritate regia soletis delibare. Nos a contra nihil ab Eduardo hac in causa gestum esse contendimus, quod non pium ac religiosum deceat principem." (Mason's Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Lib. II., cap. 16, p. 211. Edit. 1625.)

Note I, p. 442.

"In the Prayer-book of 1549, the Rubric of the Missal to which reference has just been made, was replaced by one which directed the words of consecration to be said 'without any elevation or showing the Sacrament of the people;' so that if there had been any adoration, or even any reverential regard of the elements, short of worship, it was now suppressed." (Principles at Stake, p. 271.)

"So that upon the whole, besides composing many new prayers, and the expunging several others out of the Missal, and the laying aside many ceremonies therein, these things in particular were exploded: 1. Reverence towards the Altar, there being no rubrick for it in King Edward's First Book. 2. Elevation of the Sacrament. 3. Ostension. After this Book was established, the first thing moved for to be altered therein, was to have Altars changed into Tables.

Bishop Hooper first motioned this in a sermon at court, saying, that as long as Altars remained, ignorant people and priests would dream of sacrifice. Thus, an Order of Council was issued out for changing Altars into Tables, Anno. Edw. VI., 4, 1550. And after that, 1551, there was a Review of the Common Prayer, in which the Rubricks were altered, and the priest, instead of performing the Communion Service standing before the middle of the Altar, was enjoined to to perform it standing on the North side of the Table. The present rubrick was likewise set down in the same words we have it, in the last review of the Common Prayer." (Dr. Nicholl's note on "Standing before the Table.")

On the rejection of "Elevation," etc., see Bishop Cosin's note communicated by Dr. Pickering, in Nichols's Additional Notes on Common Prayer, p. 47. Mr. Orby Shipley argues from the omission of the prohibiting rubric in 1552, that Edward's *Second* Book *sanctioned* the Elevation, which he considers "as absolutely harmless, and yet so venerable and symbolical a ceremonial." He says, "Hence, again, the custom of Elevation, for a short while formally disallowed, and by the withdrawal of the inhibition as formally restored, once more became, and still continues to be, in accordance with early English use, the unwritten, traditional, and authoritative law of the Church of England." (The Church and the World, 1866. Edit. 3d, pp. 495, 496.) I must leave my readers to judge for themselves whether the *animus* of the changes in the *Second* Book will render any support to Mr. Shipley's theory.

Surely such a prohibitory rubric is to be regarded, as having in its very nature an exceptional, occasional, and temporary character, aiming a death blow at a prevailing superstition. How then can the subsequent omission of such a rubric (and that in a Liturgy making a very decided onward step in the way of Reformation) be interpreted into a revival of that, which, before the prohibition rested on direct injunction, (See Rubric in Sarum Missal, Church Press Co., p. 311), an injunction which is now nowhere to be found?

Let it be remembered (simply as a historical fact) that the "Reformatio Legum," carefully framed by Cranmer and others, probably in 1552, (See Cardwell's Preface, p. ix.), declares distinctly, "Nec *in altum tolli* sacramentum hoc . . . . . patimur . . . . . nec *conservari* . . . . nec *adorari*." (Pages 18, 19. Edit. Cardwell.)

Bishop Hall says, "This [adoration] was most—what in the *elevation, the abolishing whereof* clears us of this imputation. You know we hate this conceit." (Works, vol. ix., p. 440. Edit. Pratt, 1808). Archbishop Laud distinctly repudiated everything of the sort. (See Bulley's Variations, p. 183.) And so did Bishop Cosin (see below, pp. 571, 575).

It is said by Catalini:—

"Verum tametsi . . . nil de Eucharistiæ Elevatione in Missa post verba Consecrationis perhibeant Sacramentarium Gregorianum, Alcuinus, Amalarius, Florus, ceterique vetustiores, altumque præterea de eo ritu Silentium fiat in antiquioribus Ordinibus Romanis; antiquior nihilominus est ipsa elevatio, quam hæretici comminiscantur." (Sacræ Cæremoniæ. Rome, 1750. Tom. ii., p. 76.) No doubt the practice itself may be (as Catalini contends) more ancient than Innocent III. (1215.) But what a loud condemnation of it in the confession of this earlier profound SILENCE! See also Migne's Patrologiæ Tomus LXXIV. De Rebus Liturgicis, Cap. xix., pp. 1007—1011, where observe (p. 1009) the appeal made to the adoration of the Greeks, which is admitted to be given to the elements *before consecration.**

"The Elevation of the Host over the head of the priest is your ordinary objection, for proof of Divine Adoration; although you have confessed that this was not of *prime* antiquity. But supposing Elevation to have been so ancient, yet was it not to the end it should be adored, no more than was the Book of the Gospel . . . And why may not we think the Elevation, for *Adoration* of the *Host*, to be an after-invention, as well as the *Elevation* of the *Chalice* for the same end? whereof it is confessed by your own Ritualist, that *The Elevation of the Chalice, that the people might adore it, was not commanded until after the days of Thomas Aquinas.*" (Morton on Eucharist; book vii., ch. 3. sec. 2, pp. 512, 513; Edit. 1635.)

Bingham says, "There are most certain demonstrations that there could be no such thing as host worship in the ancient Church, not only taken from their not believing transubstantiation and the corporal presence, but from many topics solidly deduced and substantially proved." (See Book xv., ch. v., § v,, vol. v., p. 256, sqq., and § iv., on Elevation, especially p. 247, sqq.)

* See especially L'Arroque's History of Eucharist, p. 559; Walker's Translation, 1864.

See also Payne's "Discourse concerning the Adoration of the Host," in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 116, sqq.)

"Monsieur de Meux . . . . tells us 'that the presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, ought to carry all such as believe it, without all scruple, to the adoration of it.' This therefore, being taken as a principle acknowledged by them, it may not be amiss to observe, that since it is certain that neither Christ nor His Apostles appointed or practised, nor the Church for above a thousand years required or taught any adoration of this holy Sacrament; neither could they, according to Monsieur de Meux's principles, have believed the corporeal presence of our blessed Saviour in it. . . . . When St. Paul reproved the Corinthians for violating this holy Sacrament, is it possible he could have omitted so obvious a remark* . . . . that . . . . instead of profaning, they ought, as they had been taught, to adore in it? . . . The elevation of the sacred symbols was not heard of till the seventh century, and then used only to represent the lifting up of Christ upon the cross, not to expose it to the people to adore it. The bell (A.D. 1240), the Feast of St. Sacrament, (A.D. 1264), the pomp of carrying it through the streets, (thirteenth century), all the other circumstances of this worship are inventions of yesterday. The exposing of it upon the Altar to make their prayers before it; their addresses to it in times and cases of necessity; their performing the chiefest acts of religion in its presence, never mentioned in antiquity." (Archbishop Wake's "Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England," in Gibson's Preservative, vol. xii., p. 124. See note in Paper, No. III., p. 132, and Soames's "History of Reformation," vol. iii., pp. 142, 143.)

* This divine Apostle condemns the Corinthians' irreverence in the celebration of this august Sacrament: he endeavours to make them ashamed of it. . . . yet he doth not say a word unto them of its adoration, the consideration whereof had been of very great moment." (L'Arroque "History of the Eucharist." Walker's Translation, London, 1684, p. 564.)

Note K., p. 442.

"It is a strong evidence of the prudence and discernment of the English divines, and especially of the primate who presided over them, that they drew up so temperate a form of public worship, when the great body of the people for whom it was designed were totally unfitted for any further alteration." (Cardwell's Preface to Liturgies of Edward, p. 16.)

"But this Liturgy being, as some conceived, not thoroughly racked from the lees of superstition, the King and Parliament, desirous to give all reasonable satisfaction to malcontents, gave order (probably to the same persons, or so many of them as were then living), that the Book should be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect." (L'Estrange "Alliance of Divine Offices, Edit. Oxford, p. 44.)

"When men are in danger of burning, as they leap from the flames they consider not whither, but whence; and the first reflexions of a crooked tree are not to straightness, but to a contrary incurvation. Yet it pleased the Spirit of God so to temper and direct their spirits, that in the first Liturgy of King Edward, they did rather retain something that needed further consideration, than reject anything that was certainly pious and holy; and in the second Liturgy, that they might also throughly reform, they did rather cast out something that might with good profit have remained, than not satisfy the world of their zeal to reform, of their charity in declining everything that was offensive, and the clearness of their light in discerning every semblance of error or suspicion in the Roman Church. The truth is, although they framed the Liturgy with the greatest consideration that could be, by all the united wisdom of Church and State, yet as if prophetically to avoid their being charged in after ages with a crepusculum of religion, a dark twilight, imperfect reformation, they joined to their own star all the shining tapers of the other reformed Churches, calling for the advice of the most eminently learned and zealous reformers in other kingdoms, that the light of all together might show them a clear path to walk in. And this their care produced some change; for upon the consultation, the first form of King Edward's Service Book was approved, with the exception of a

very few clauses, which upon that occasion were reviewed and expunged, till it came to that second form and modest beauty it was in the edition of MDLII., and which Gilbertus, a German, approved of as a transcript of the ancient and primitive forms." (Bishop Jeremy Taylor's "Preface to Apology for Set Forms." Works, vol. v., pp. 234—5.)

Note L., p. 443.

This uprooting was the result of resolute determination in spite of opposition.

"A Review was made of the Book of Common Prayer, about the latter end of the year, by Archbishop Cranmer, and the Bishops. Divers things that favoured too much of superstition, were endeavoured to be changed or amended. But there were among them some *that* MADE *what* OPPOSITION THEY *could*." (Strype's Cranmer, book ii., ch. xvii., p. 210. Edit. 1694.)

It was no wise inconsistent with such a determination to maintain that the *First* Book was, in its teaching on the Eucharist, *defensible*, and its expressions quite *capable* of a sound exposition.

So Cranmer, when his views were thoroughly *reformed*, defended what might be considered the point most difficult of defence in the First Book.

In reply to Gardiner, Cranmer says, "As for the Book of Common Prayer, although it say, that in each part of the bread broken is received the whole body of Christ, yet it saith not so of the parts unbroken, nor yet of the parts or whole reserved, as the Papists teach. But as in baptism we receive the Holy Ghost, and put Christ upon us, as well if we be christened in one dish full of water taken out of the font, as if we were christened in the whole font or river; so we be as truly fed, refreshed, and comforted by Christ, receiving a piece of bread at the Lord's holy table, as if we did eat an whole loaf." (On Lord's Supper, p. 64.)

So also, as regards the Catechism of Lutheran origin, the English translation of which had been authorized by Cranmer in 1548; Cranmer

maintains, that it is *capable* of conveying a sound sense, if soundly explained and understood. He says in answer to Gardiner, "In that Catechism I teach not, as you do, that the body and blood of Christ is contained in the sacrament, being reserved, but that in the ministration thereof we receive the body and blood of Christ; whereunto if it may please you to add or understand this word 'spiritually,' then is my Catechism sound and good in all men's ears, which know the true doctrine of the sacraments." (On Lord's Supper, p. 227, see p. 19, 21, 188, 190, 106, 256, 374. See also Original Letters, P. S. Edit., vol. ii., p. 381, and note there and p. 643; and Strype's Cranmer, book ii., ch. v., p. 160; also, P. S. to Paper No. V., pp. 287, 288.)

Expressions might be quite capable of a sound interpretation, which yet, being capable not unnaturally of an unsound interpretation also, might be as *roots* out of which error and superstition might grow. Such expressions needed *explaining*. And the changes in the *Second* Book were such *explanations* of what was ambiguous in the *First*.

Note M., p. 443.

No doubt some parts were *new*, WITH *sufficient cause*. But what there is of *innovating work* in the compilation of our Prayer Book is all the more *conspicuous* and *telling*, and *indicative*, from its standing in such strong contrast with the *general conservatism* manifested.

"The old Roman Liturgy was a leprous house, the plague was spead in it: but our wise Reformers purged it from all appearance of infection. They picked out all the stumbling blocks of idolatry, the walls were scraped and cleansed from the dust of superstition, etc. Though it has been accused of many plague-sores, and those sores pricked, yet no corruption hath appeared; and therefore it is to be judged clean, and to enter into the holy campe." (From "Beaten Oil for the Sanctuary"; 1641, quoted from the MSS. notes in the interleaved Prayer Book, Harleian MS. No. 7311, p. 13. Compare Bisse's "Beauty of Holiness," p. 16, 17. And see Palmer's Origines Liturgicæ, vol. ii., p. 2.)

To the objection of the Puritans that the Papists looked on our Book as a compliance with them, Hammond in answer, says, "I shall —1. demand, is there any *superstition* or *idolatry* in that part of the *Service* wherein we thus comply with them? if so, 'tis more than *a compliance with Papists*, 'tis in itself a down-right damning sin; and if there be not, but all that is *idolatrous* or *superstitious* in their service is reformed in ours, then sure this will be far from confirming them in either of those, if they depend anything upon our *judgments*, or our *compliance*. 2. . . . . This affirmation is as gross. . . . . as any one which the *Assemblers* have condemned in them. For, 3. The truth is notorious, that our *Reformers* retained not any part of *Popish Service*, REFORMED their *Breviary* and *Processional*, and *Mass Book;* AS they did their DOCTRINE, retained nothing but what the Papists had received from purer *antiquity*, and was as clear from the true charge of Popery, as any period in either *Prayer*, or *Sermon* in the *Directory;* which argues our *compliance* with the *Ancient Church*,* and not with them; the very thing that *Isaac Cassaubon* so admired in this Church of ours, the care of *antiquity and purity*.' (View of New Directory, in Works, Edit. 1684, p. 386.)

Bishop Jeremy Taylor says, "To the Churches of the Roman Communion, we can say that ours [*i.e.* our Liturgy] is Reformed; to the Reformed Churches we can say that ours is orderly and decent; for we were freed from the impositions and lasting errors of a tyrannical spirit, and yet from the extravagancies of a popular spirit too; our reformation was done without tumult, and yet we saw it necessary to reform; we were *zealous to cast away the old errors*, but our zeal was balanced with consideration and the results of authority: not like women and children when they are affrighted with fire in their clothes; we *shaked off the coal indeed*, but not the garments, lest we should have exposed our Church to that nakedness, which the excellent men of our sister Churches complained to be among themselves." (In Works, vol. v., p. 233-4.)

"The Holy Scriptures and antiquity were carefully consulted;

* "Throughout this service [the Roman Mass] the aspect of Holy Communion as a means of partaking in the body and blood of Christ bears no proportion to its sacrificial aspect. In this respect the Roman Ordinary and Canon is *not only in the greatest contrast with our own*, but with all primitive Liturgies. If the Liturgies of St. Clement or St. Mark, for instance, agree in the main with the form of service received from the Apostles, the Roman does not." (Saddler in "The Church and the Age," p. 288.)

and all things examined according to the exactest measures that could be taken from them; and a diligent distinction made of what was Popery, and what was true and Catholic Christianity, that so the one only might be rejected, the other duly retained." (Abp. Wake in Gibson's Peservative, vol. x., p. 77.)

"We will give an account of this form of Service which we use, deriving it higher than the *Roman* Breviary or Mass, from which it is charged to come; and shewing, where it shall be requisite, that the corruptions of the Mass are laid aside in it." (Bp. Cosin's Preface to Notes on Common Prayer, in Nicholls' Additional Notes, p. 2.)

"That they [our Martyrs] had a great opinion of the piety and unblameable composure of the Common Prayer Book, appears, 1, in the challenge made in its behalf by the Archbishop Cranmer, to defend it against all the world of enemies; 2, by the daily using it in time of persecution and imprisonment; for so did Bishop Ridley, and Doctor Taylor, who also recommended it to his wife for a legacy; 3, by their preaching in behalf of it, as many did; 4, by Hullier's hugging it in his flames, with a posture of great love and forwardness of entertainment; 5, besides the direct testimony which the most eminent learned among the Queen Mary martyrs have given of it. Amongst which that of the learned rector of Hadley, Doctor Rowland Taylor, is most considerable: his words are these in a letter to a friend: 'But there was, after that, set forth by the most innocent King Edward (for whom God be praised everlastingly) the whole Church Service, with great deliberation, and the advice of the best learned men of the realm, and authorized by the whole parliament, and received and published gladly by the whole realm; which Book was *never reformed but once*, and yet by that *one reformation* it was *so fully perfected* according to the rules of our Christian religion in every behalf, that no Christian conscience could be offended with anything therein contained, I mean *of that book* REFORMED."* (Bishop J. Taylor's Works, vol. v., p. 248. See also

* A story was current among the exiles at Frankfort, to the effect that Cranmer "had drawn up a Book of Prayer an hundred times more perfect . . . . yet the same could not take place, for that he was matched with such a wicked clergy, and Convocation, with other enemies." Mr. Jenkyns says, "Strype does not seem to have had sufficient grounds for attributing this report to Bullinger, but he is fully justified in treating it as altogether unworthy of credit. The Archbishop's 'authority,' he says, 'was now very great, so that there was undoubtedly great deference paid to it, as also to his wisdom and

Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., pp. 474, 646, 652; Edit. Pratt, 1808. And Bishop Gauden's Eccles. Angl. Suspiria, p. 88; 1659.)

Bishop Hall says, "If any man will now say, that our Prayer Book is taken out of the Mass, let him know rather, that the Mass was cast out of our Prayer Book, into which it was injuriously and impiously intruded: the good of those prayers are ours, in the right of Christians; the evil, that was in them, let them take as their own. And, if it should have been as they imagine, let them know, that we have departed from the Church of Rome but in those things, wherein they have departed from Christ: what good thing they have is ours still: that Scripture which they have, that Creed which they profess, is ours; neither will we part with it, for their abuse. If a piece of gold be offered us, will we not take it, because it was taken out of the Channel? If the Devil have given a Confession of Christ, and said, *I know who thou art, even Jesus, the Son of* the Living God; shall not I make this Confession, because it came out of the Devil's mouth? . . . . This then is the form which hath been compiled by learned and holy Divines, by blessed Martyrs themselves; who used it comfortably and blessed God for it. . . . . Let us hate Popery, to the death; but let us not involve within that odious name those holy Forms both of administration and devotion, which are both pleasing unto God, and agreeable to all Christianity and Godliness." (Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 813. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

The following words are from the pen of the late Canon Hugh Stowell:

"So far from denying, we avow, that many, not to say most, of the prayers of our Church are far older than the Reformation, yea,

learning, by the rest of the divines appointed to that work: so that as nothing was by them inserted in the Liturgy, but by his good allowance and approbation, so neither would they reject or oppose what he thought fit should be put in or altered.' To this it may be added, that if Cranmer's project had been really laid aside to make way for one with which he was not thoroughly satisfied, he would scarcely have undertaken a short time afterwards to prove, 'that not only the common prayers of the Church, the ministration of the Sacraments, and other rites and Ceremonies, but also all the doctrine and religion set forth by King Edward, was more pure and according to God's word than any other doctrine that hath been used in England these thousand years:' and again, 'that the order of the Church set out at this present by Act of Parliament is the same that was used in the Church fifteen hundred years passed.'" (Preface of Jenkyns's "Remains of Cranmer," pp. liii. liv. See also Cardwell's Two Liturgies, Preface, p. xxxv., note; and Lathbury, Hist. of Com. Prayer, p. 121.)

have come down to us from the primitive periods of Christianity.

And when some would tauntingly tell us, 'Yes, you borrowed them from Rome; and whilst you denounce that Church, you have not disdained to filch from her some of the choicest portions of your liturgy;' our answer is, "They came to us *through* Rome, but they did not come to us *from* Rome.' They belonged to the primitive Church—and consequently to our own branch of it—long before the novelties of Romanism were engrafted on it. Those precious prayers resembled in their fate the vessels of silver and gold which had been dedicated to the worship of the true God in Jerusalem, but were afterwards carried into Babylon, and there desecrated to the worship of gods of wood and stone; and when the Reformation took place, our Reformers did as those who returned from the captivity in Babylon had done: they did not fling away and shiver to pieces the beautiful vessels that their fathers had used in their holy solemnities, because they had been defiled by idolaters, but they purified and sanctified them, and replaced them in their renovated temple. Even so, the prayer called the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, the glorious Te Deum, the incomparable Litany, and other portions of our services, resounded in the Churches of the saints long before it was dreamt that St. Peter was the vicar of Christ, and the Pope the successor of St. Peter; long before Christian worship was defiled with the invocations of saints and angels, the adoration of the Virgin, or the idolatry of the Mass. All, therefore, that our Reformers did, was to divest the pristine formularies of the corrupt additions which had been forced upon them in Rome, and to restore them to the renovated Church in their primeval purity and loveliness."* (Excellences of the English Liturgy, p. 14, 15, S. P. C. K.)

* Toplady writes: "'The liturgy' says he, 'or common prayers, were chiefly taken from the offices of the Church of Rome.' This, I well know, is a pretty general opinion. But I cannot help believing it to be unjustly founded. The agreement, between some parts of our public service, and some parts of the Romish Missals, falls extremely short of proving the main point. We use the Lord's prayer (for example) in common with the papists; yet we receive it, not from Rome, but from the New Testament. A pen, not altogether contemptible, affirms, that the compilers of the liturgy examined not only the popish forms, but likewise 'all other service books then in use.' (Downes) . . . . 'Our Church of England,' says bishop Stillingfleet, 'hath omitted none of those offices wherein all the ancient Churches were agreed: and where the [primitive] British or Gallican Church] differed from the Roman, our [present] Church hath not followed the Roman, but the other. And therefore our dissenters do unreasonably charge us with taking our offices from the Church of Rome.'" (Toplady's Works, 1825, vol. i., p. 411, note.)

Note N, p. 445.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor speaking of our Reformers, and ou Prayer Book, says: "So that if they, dying in attestation of thi Book, were martyrs, why do we condemn the Book, for which the died? If *we will not call them martyrs, it is clear we have change our religion* since then; and then it should be *considered whither w are fallen.* The Reformers of King Edward's time died for it; i Queen Elizabeth's time they avowed it, under the protection of a excellent Princess; but in the sad interval of Queen Mary's reign suffered persecution: and it is but an unhandsome compliance fc Reformers to be unlike their brethren, and to be like their enemies to do, as do the Papists, and only to speak great words against then And it will *be sad to live in an age that should disavow King Edward and Queen Elizabeth's religion,* and manner of worshipping God; an in an age that shall do as did Queen Mary's bishops, reject and cor demn the Book of Common Prayer, and the religion contained i it." (Bishop Jeremy Taylor's Preface to Apology for Forms (Prayer, vol. v., p. 249.)

Hammond says of "The Liturgy of the Church of England, whic was at first, as it were, written in blood, at the least sealed, an delivered down to us by the martyrdom of most of the compilers (it." (Preface to View of New Directory.) "I should think all me that have covenanted to reform according to the example of the bes reformed churches, indispensably obliged to conform to the Kin Edward or Queen Elizabeth—English Reformation, the most perfec regular pattern that Europe yieldeth." (View of New Directory Works, 1684, p. 360.)

Note O, p. 448.

The general correctness of the view here taken of the revision i Edward's reign is admitted by Hardwick. The matter is so importa that I desire to fortify my position by a few extracts from his Histor of the Reformation: "With reference to some, indeed, of the dispute questions, no concession could be drawn from the commissioner

because they felt that relaxation where the voice of Scripture and Antiquity was unequivocal, would have involved a dereliction of their sacred trust. The *only* office in which change of *doctrine* seems to be at all discernible is that which had *peculiarly excited* the displeasure of one section of the Church,—the Office for the Holy Communion. Nor is it probable that variations would have been there adopted if the structure had not been *repugnant* to the *new convictions* of the *principal revisers*. We have seen the primate gradually abandoning his former tenets with respect to the nature of the Eucharistic Presence, even at the time when he was actively engaged in the construction of the First Prayer Book. Frequent conversations with John Laski, and prolonged examination of Scriptural and patristic authorities, had ultimately induced him to look with favour on the 'Calvinistic' hypothesis; and when, in 1550, he came down into the lists to wrestle with the champions of the Mediæval dogma, it was obvious that his principles, in this particular at least, had reached their full development (1550). As Cranmer had devoted *long and patient study* to the Eucharistic controversy, so he wrote upon it with no ordinary power and precision" (pp. 224—226.) "Such was, probably, the state of mind in which the archbishop and some of his more active coadjutors now *resolved* to modify the structure of the Eucharistic office in the first Edwardine Prayer Book. They approached the task allotted to them *under strong excitement*, not, indeed, persuaded that the office then in use was *absolutely unjustifiable*, but prompted by a gradual *modification* of THEIR OWN FEELINGS AND IDEAS to alter some particulars which gave a handle to objections on the one side, and offended scruples on the other. And the changes ultimately brought about *correspond with this construction*. . . . Yet the various modifications thus effected wrought no very serious changes in the character of the Prayer Book. It was still, in all its leading features, and in the great bulk of its materials, an accumulation of ancient wisdom, a bequest of ancient piety: it was the form of words and bond of faith uniting English worshippers with saints and martyrs of antiquity; it was 'the Primitive Church speaking to the generations of these latter days.'" (pp. 228, 229. See also Soames's History of Reformation, vol. iii., pp. 178, 179.)

Such a statement as the above, from the pen of Archdeacon

Hardwick, renders it needless to say anything in refutation of the theory that in 1552 "accident, not design, seems to have ruled the day." (See "The Church and the World," 1866, Edit. iii., p. 485.)

When, however, it is said that the task of revision was approached "under *strong excitement*," we must not understand *such excitement* as leads men to do hastily and intemperately what, after calm deliberation, may be regretted. This appears from what is truly said of "*the new convictions*," formed after "long and patient study," resulting in *resolution* to modify the structure of the Eucharistic office. Nothing, indeed, could well be more unreasonable than to regard the changes made as made with undue speed, or under any temporary pressure. The subject of revision had been brought before Convocation as early as 1550, and many alterations then concluded. (See Peter Martyr's Letter, Jan. 10, 1550-1, in Collier's Eccles. Hist., vol. v., p. 434; and Hook's Lives, Series ii., vol. ii., p. 284. Also Procter on Common Prayer, p. 34 and 31.)

Indeed, it would appear more than probable that *at the time* of the drawing up the *first* Prayer Book some matters were retained only as a temporary measure, with the intention of removing them from a *second* book. Thus Bucer and Fagius write to the ministers of Strasburgh, April 26, 1549: "We yesterday waited upon the Archbishop of Canterbury, that most benevolent and kind father of the Churches and of godly men; who received and entertains us as brethren, not as dependents. We found at his house, what was most gratifying to us, our dear friend Doctor Peter Martyr, with his wife, and his attendant, Julius, Master Immanuel, [Tremellius] with his wife; asd also Dryander, and some other godly Frenchmen whom we had sent before us. All these are entertained by the Archbishop of Canterbury. . . . . As soon as the description of the ceremonies now in use shall have been translated into Latin, we will send it to you. We hear that some *concessions* have been made both to a *respect for antiquity*, and to *the* INFIRMITY of *the present age;* such for instance, as the vestments commonly used in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and the use of candles: so also in regard to the commemoration of the dead, and the use of chrism; for we know not to what extent or in what sort it prevails. They affirm that there is no superstition in these things, and that they are ONLY *to be retained* FOR A TIME, lest the people, not having yet learned Christ

should be deterred by too extensive innovations from embracing his religion, and that they may be won over. This circumstance, however, greatly refreshed us, that all the services in the churches are read and sung in the vernacular tongue, that the doctrine of justification is purely and soundly taught, and the Eucharist administered according to Christ's ordinance, private masses being abolished." (Original Letters, P. S. Edit., ii., pp. 535, 536.)

And such an intention was perfectly in accordance with the wisdom which had previously (March, 1548) put forth "the order of the Communion"; by which (though the last rubric for *second consecration* directs "without any levation or lifting up") the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is to be delivered to the people under both kinds, (according to the direction of Parliament and Convocation,) but "*without the varying of any other rite or ceremony in the Mass*, (UNTIL OTHER ORDER SHALL BE PROVIDED)"; (see First Rubric; Cardwell's Liturgies, p. 428, 432, and Pref., p. ix.,) this being accompanied by a proclamation, in which the people are exhorted to conformity, "that we may be encouraged FROM TIME TO TIME *further to travail for the reformation* and setting forth of such godly orders as may be most to God's glory, the edifying of our subjects, and for the advancement of true religion. Which thing we (by the help of God) MOST EARNESTLY INTEND to bring to effect, willing all our loving subjects in the mean time to stay and quiet themselves with our direction, as men content to follow authority." (See Cardwell's Liturgies, p. 426.)

It is surely, then, a great mistake to speak at all of the Edward's *First* Book as alone representing the true character of the *English* Reformation, and as the only Book which should be regarded as the genuine work of our *English* Reformers; and as if Edward's *second* Book were to be set down to the work or the undue influence of *Foreign* Reformers, and to be looked upon as stamped with the character of the Genevan, as distinguished from the English Reformation. (See Heylin's History of Reformation, E. H. S. Edit., vol. i., pp. 227, 228; Collier's Eccles. Hist., vol. v., p. 434; Brett's Liturgies, pp. 398, 399, etc., etc.; Medd's Introduction to First Book of Edward, pp. xii., xiii.; The Church and the World, 1866 Edit. 3d, pp. 475, and 313; J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, Introd., p. xxx.; Bp. Jolly's Christian Sacrifice, p. 124.)

Much more must it be accounted, I think, a complete mis-

apprehension to suppose that there was any intention in the minds of our Reformers of bringing our Liturgy into "stricter conformity with the earlier Sarum use"; and that "had they been allowed free course of action, and longer time for its developement, there is little doubt that the Liturgy of that Book [1549] would have been assimilated yet more closely to the ancient office from whence it sprang."* (See "The Church and the World," 1866. Edit. 3, p. 476.)

No doubt Calvin's influence, like that of Bucer and Martyr, was on the side of revision; but this is only saying that it was on the same side as our leading English Reformers. As to Calvin's language concerning the Prayer Book, there is some reason for believing that what he said was said under misinformation as to what the Book contained.† (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 287, note, and p. 46, note.)

* Mr. M. F. Sadler writes—"The real question is this: Is the will of the Great Institutor respecting the celebration of His memorial communion to be found in the Missals and Ritual Directories of Mediæval Christendom? Are these so bound up with His glory that, after 300 years of desuetude, they are to be revived as far as possible, though the rending of our own Church, and the repudiation of Sacramental truth by our own nation be the result? We have men—grave, learned, devout men—who by their every argument *imply* this. Dare they *assert* it? With the account of the institution in the New Testament; with the Primitive Liturgies; with the history of the Early Church in their hands, dare they assert it? The English branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church has decided very emphatically that the words of the Mediæval Service were not acceptable to Him, for she has substituted for it a service, the great bulk of which is in very different language, notwithstanding its retention of certain features common to all old offices. She was, we believe, fully justified in making this change, for, compared with the most ancient types of Liturgy, such as the Clementine and Alexandrian, the service which she has set aside is new, and hardly, a 'reasonable' service. Judged by its own rubrics, and by the views of those who now use it, it is the most inconsistent service in existence." (The Church and the Age, p. 313.)

† If it be true that overtures were made by Calvin and others to Edward VI. on the subject of Episcopacy, and that his letters were intercepted by Gardyner and Bonner, and a forged answer returned in the name of the English protestants, 'wherein they checked Calvin, and slighted his proposals.' (See note in Jenkyns's Cranmer, Preface, p. cv., note), it can hardly be wondered at that Calvin felt a little sore on the subject of the English Church and her Liturgy.

Note P, p. 449.

It is impossible to view the changes made in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. apart from their doctrinal significance. The First Prayer Book might have been used in a Communion which rejected the Real Objective Presence. But it certainly would not have borne witness, as the Second does, and still more as the *change* from the First to the Second does, that this Church of England *hath* (to use Whitgift's words) refused the Real Presence.

And the question of restoring the use, or the permission to use the First Communion Service instead of the Second cannot now be entertained apart from views of doctrinal significance. Upon merely liturgical grounds some might regret that the changes made in Edward's days were so thorough and sweeping, who yet must be deeply thankful that those changes were made, and still stand, to testify to our Reformers' sense of the danger, and wise determination, as far as might be, to exclude the possibility of the growing up again of the doctrine they rejected. So again, opinions may be quoted of preference for the First Book from some eminent divines, (see Medd's Introduction to Walton's "First Book of Edward VI.," p. xvi., sqq.) and if we saw no danger and no possibility of the bringing in again the doctrine, for rejecting which, many of our Reformers died, those opinions might be entitled to considerable liturgical weight. But if anything be wanting to justify the wisdom of our Reformers, and to make us grateful for having the *Second* Prayer Book instead of the *First*, surely it may be found in the shelter which such expressions of opinion seem to afford for those who in our days (when the danger is realized) would desire to undo the work of the Reformers, and therefore on doctrinal grounds would bring in the First Book, to crush out the very truth, to which the Second bears such important testimony.

Moreover, when it is pleaded that the Act of Uniformity which authorized Edward *Second* Book speaks with approval of the *First*, it must be observed, 1. that such approval is modified by the words which speak of the Second as made *more perfect*, and 2. that such approval is clearly given to the *First* as *explained by* the Second (see the words "As well for the more plain and manifest explanation hereof as for the more perfection of the said order of common service. . . . .

The King's most excellent Majesty. . . . . hath caused the foresaid order of common service. . . . . to be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect." See Liturgies of Edward VI. in P. S. Edit., p. 214—5,) that is to say, that expressions in the First Book being capable of two senses, the Second Book takes away from it one, and stamping clearly the other sense, so *approves* it. (See Dr. Heurtley's "Remarks on Declaration," p. 14, 15.) Thus it is that Cranmer, while the First Book is standing, explains the meaning of the Consecration Prayer, in language which afterwards becomes almost the very words of that Consecration Prayer in the Second Book. These are His words: "And therefore, in the Book of the Holy Communion, we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that *unto us* in* that holy mystery they may be so; that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same, that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished. And a like prayer of old time were all the people wont to make at the communion of all such offerings as at that time all the people used to offer, praying that their offerings†

* So Herbert Thorndike writes: "These words *to us*, make an abatement in the proper signification of the *body and blood*. For the elements may be said to become the body and blood of Christ *without addition*, in the same *true* sense in which they are so called in the Scriptures; but when they are said to become the body and blood of Christ *to them that communicate*, that *true* sense is so well signified and expressed, that the words cannot well be understood otherwise than to import, not the *corporal substance*, but the *spiritual use* of them." (Relig. Assembl., p. 369, quoted in Waterland's Works, vol. iv., p. 689, note.)

So also Archbishop Laud says of the expression "*ut fiant nobis*" that "it clearly implies that they are *to us*, but are not transubstantiated *in themselves*, unto the body and blood of Christ, nor that there is any *corporal* presence in or under the elements." (See Bulley's Variations, p. 184.)

"If it should be asked, How they are so *unto us*, if they be not first *absolutely so? Answer:* They are said to be so unto us, when the *beneficial effect* goes along with them." (Waterland's Works, vol. iv., p. 695, note. See also, Bishop Field's Parasceve Paschæ, pp. 114, 1624; and Hooker, vol. ii., p. 362. Edit. Keble.)

Far otherwise Grabe writes, "De forma Consecrationis," p. 20. London, 1721.

† It was desired, at the last Review, that the Rubric should direct the Priest to "*offer up* and place" the elements on the Table. (See Archdeacon Harrison on Rubrics, p. 353.) And the rejection of this proposal is additional evidence of the wise caution of the Convocation, and the check which was given to the attempts then made to introduce Laudian Theology into our Prayer Book.

The offering of the Elements, however, (in some sense) is altogether distinct from the

might be unto them the body and blood of Christ." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 79. See Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 56; and Bishop Patrick, Christian Sacrifice, p. 56—59, Edit. 1690.)

This being so, it must be obvious that it is quite vain for those who now dislike the *Second* Book, and desire to return to the *First*, to bring forward in their support from the Act of Uniformity, or from the writings of our Reformers, expressions of approval of the *First* Book. (See "The Church and the World," 1866, 3rd Edit., p. 323, 476, and Cooke's Letter to Perry, "Of Ceremonies, etc.," p. 113.) What they want, to give any real support to their position, and what we ask them (in no captious spirit) to produce *if they can*, is an expression (either in the Act, or in the writings of our Reformers) of distinct and decided *preference* for the *First*, or *regret* for the changes made in the *Second*, and in particular an expression of adherence to that *doctrinal sense* admissible (or apparently admissible) in the *First*, which finds no place in the explanation of the *Second* Book of Edward. We have no quarrel with our Reformers, nor with the Act of Uniformity for speaking well of the *First* Book. Even the Westminster Assembly say of the Prayer Book, that "it occasioned many godly and learned men to rejoice much in it at that time it was set forth, because the Mass and the rest of the Latin service, being removed, the public worship was celebrated in our

Sacrifice of the Ritualists, and has been taught or allowed by some of the strongest opponents of the Corporal Presence, as for instance by Bullinger, (see Goode's Rule of Faith, vol. ii., p. 374), by Peter Martyr (see Loci Communes, p. 1390, 1654, Basil, 1580), by Baxter (see Hickes's Treatises, vol. iii., p. 281, Ang. Cath. Library Edit.) On this subject see Bingham's Antiquities, vol. v., pp. 24—26, and Waterland's Works, vol. v., p. 163 and 182.

As to the different senses in which the word "oblations" has been understood in the Prayer for the Church Militant, the reader may be referred to Bishop Patrick's Mensa Mystica, p. 35, (London, 1717), Cardwell's Conferences, p. 382; Goode's Rule of Faith, vol. ii., pp. 376, sqq. Mant's Clergyman's Obligations, pp. 147, 148. Essays on the Church, p. 184. Robertson's "How shall we Conform?" pp. 185—188, and 394. Blakeney on Common Prayer, p. 433. Trevor's Sacrifice and Participation, p. 248. Bishop of Llandaff's Charge, 1866, p. 110. Prayer Book interleaved, p. 169. Humphrey's Student's Common Prayer, p. 125. See also Bulley's Variations, pp. 155—159, and 163.

Mede says—"So have they [the Churches of the Roman Communion] for many ages disused this *Oblation of Bread and Wine*, and brought in, in lieu thereof, a *real and hypostatical Oblation of Christ Himself*. This *blasphemous Oblation* we have taken away, and justly." (Mede's Works, p. 376. Edit. 1677.)

own tongue." (Preface to Directory.) And as little should we desire to have any controversy on this matter with the Ritualists, for speaking in admiration of the *First* Book (in comparison* of the Service Books in use before) if (with our Reformers and the Act of Uniformity) they spoke of the *Second* Book as *more perfect* than the *First*. We should not even care to say a word against the choice of any, who (in our own or previous days) may have expressed (for reasons connected with Liturgical lore alone, or even with a desire to impress somewhat more of the character of a *commemorative* and *figurative* sacrifice) a feeling of *preference* for the *First* Book, if, in the matter of *doctrine*, they disclaimed all desire to add anything to the *Second*. Thus, *e. g.*, Archbishop Sharp is quoted as supporting the preference for Edward's First Book. (See Bishop Jolly's "Christian Sacrifice," p. 123.) But how little support Archbishop Sharp will render to those *doctrinal views*, on account of which that Prayer Book is *now* by some preferred, will appear clearly enough from the following Extracts:—"He (St. Paul) says downright, that Christ was *never to be offered but once*. Aye, but say they, his meaning is, that Christ was never to be offered but once in the same form and figure: in another form and figure the Apostle allows that He is offered every day. If this be the Apostle's meaning, is he not wonderfully sincere in his affirmations? even just as sincere as I should be, if I should make oath that I never saw such a person but once in my life; meaning, that I never saw him but once in such a garb or habit: but in other habits I cannot deny but that I have seen him a thousand times." (Works, vol. v., pp. 202, 203, Edit. Oxford 1829.)

* The change from the Sarum rite in 1549 was *very great indeed*. Mr. M. F. Saddler says—"If we take even the Communion Office of 1549, and compare it with the Canon according to the Use of Sarum, we find that *by far the greater part of it is new*. It doubtless embodies more or less of the leading features of the ancient offices, as well as of that which it superseded; but, of the greater part of these features, both the wording and the liturgical position are very materially altered. . . . . The leading ideas of the two services materially differ: whereas the Old Service is mainly a *sacrificial* rite, the New is MAINLY *a communion or partaking;* whereas in the Old Services the commemorative or sacrificial action (or rather actions) is altogether severed from the partaking on the part of the people, in the new it is inseparably bound up with it: whereas in the Old Service the Celebrant is everything, so that he can perform the *whole action by himself;* in the New, on the contrary, he is never *contemplated apart from the united action of* that mystical body of which he is the minister." (The Church and the Age, p. 305.)

"For this virtue that they assign to this their sacrifice of applying to believers the benefits of Christ's first sacrifice, it is the strangest one that was ever heard of. . . . . Was it ever heard that the benefit of a sacrifice was to be applied to men by the means of offering up another sacrifice? How can anything be applied to men, by being offered up and applied to God? It is just as if we should apply the physic, or the salves that are prescribed, not to the patient, or the wounded person, but to the physician who prescribes them." (Ibid, p. 205.)

When, therefore, Archbishop Sharp expressed his admiration of Edward's First Book, we may be sure, he meant the First Book, as doctrinally explained by the Second.*

We cannot but feel strongly that if now we were to lay aside the *Second* Book of Edward for the *First*, (or for one framed upon the model of the *First*) the *First* Book thus *restored* would hardly be explained (according to the views of our Reformers) by the *Second* thus *rejected*. For would not the change be made under the pressure of influences which on doctrinal grounds *dislike* the *Second* Book, and would *choose* the *First* because of the *First's* admitting that sense which is disallowed by the explanation of the Second? (See "The Church and the World," 1866, Edit. 3rd, p. 313.)

Very observable therefore, and highly significant are such words as the following from the pen of Mr. Orby Shipley.

"The Church party emphatically deprecate under existing circumstances, any change whatever in the Prayer Book. But in the event of revision being determined upon by authority which they can alone acknowledge, they are prepared to advance towards that standard to which each successive restoration has approximated, and I have it in my power to say, that a large body of Churchmen, (both lay and clerical), including all the foremost leaders of the Catholic school, (and amongst them, I will add, the reverend and beloved teacher so lately taken from amongst us was one), in the event of a revision being forced upon the Church, would demand a restoration in conformity with the First Book of Edward VI. On such a question, by such petitioners, what is thus demanded must be entertained, and will

* In like manner Bishop Horsley's commendation of Edward's first book must (I think) be understood as involving no sort of approval of the *doctrine* of the Real Objective Presence. (See Bishop Horsley's Charges, p. 163. Dundee, 1813.)

in all likelihood, be conceded." ("The Church and the World," p. 518—9.)

Note Q, p. 450.

The word "Mysteries" here seems to be so often misunderstood (almost as if it must be the nature of a "mystery" to mistify,—see Burgess; Reformed Church of England, p. 150) that it may be well to give one or two quotations which may help to clear its true meaning. "Sacraments are called mysteries, because in a dark speech they hide other things which are more holy. And Paul willingly useth this word in his Epistles. And why this word was attributed to the holy signs of the Christian Church, there is a plain reason; for these things are only known to the faithful, and are hid from those that are profane and unholy. And surely the preaching of the Gospel itself is called 'The Mystery of the Kingdom of God,' to teach us, that, the unclean being shut out, it is revealed to the only children of God." (Bullinger's Decades, v., 237.)

"It is called a mystery, or a holy secrecy; for that our eye beholdeth one thing, and our faith another." (Jewel; Sermon and Harding, p. 515.)

"Two . . . because what is intended by them [the sacraments,] is not immediately discernible by what is done, without some explication, (their significancy being not wholly grounded in the nature but depending upon arbitrary institution, as that of words, which is of kin to them; whence St. Austin calls a Sacrament, *verbum visibile*) have usually been called Mysteries, (that is, actions of a close and occult importance, of deeper meaning and design, than is obvious to ordinary perception) and thence are also called Sacraments." (Barrow, Works, 1683, vol. i., p. 542. See Professor Hey's Lectures, vol. ii., p. 490.)

"The word *mystery* as used by St. Paul, signifies something kept *secret* and hidden, and generally something *sacred* and *divine*, which cannot be discovered by Natural Reason, but *is* UNFOLDED by Divine Revelation." (Wordsworth on Ephes. v. 32.)

"μυστήριον either from Gr. μύω *to shut;* or from Heb. (mistar) from root (sathar) *to hide;* hence something which is involved, or concealed, or symbolized by something external, as the soul in the body,—a *sacramentum.*" (Wordsworth on Matt. xiii. 11. See Malan's Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Note, p. 5.)

"A *most unscriptural and dangerous* sense is but too often put upon this word, as if it meant something *absolutely unintelligible* and *incomprehensible.* A strange mistake! Since in almost every text wherein μυστήριον is used, it is mentioned as something which is *revealed, declared, shown, spoken,* or which *may be known* or *understood.*" (Parkhurst's Lexicon in voc. See Whittaker's Disputation, P. S. Edit., p. 252.)

No doctrinal argument then, it seems to me, in favour of the Real Objective Presence can be built upon this word. (See Freeman's Principles of Divine Service, vol. ii., part 1, p. 18, sqq. S. C. Malan On Ritualism, pp. 68—71. Bingham's Antiquities, book x., chap. v., vol. iii., pp. 379, 380.)

Beza indeed (who constantly, like Calvin, applies the word *mystery* to the Eucharist) from this word makes an argument which tells powerfully against the Real Objective Presence. He says "Sæpe sum miratus fieri potuisse ut in Sacramentaria institutione explicanda, in qua constat figuratè* pleraque dici, quoniam hæc est μυστηρίων natura, nonnulli omnia ut propriè dicta acciperent." (Tract Theol., vol. ii., p. 188. Genev., 1582.)

Indeed the expression "*high mysteries*" is used in the Middleburgh Prayer Book, which had the sanction of Cartwright and the approval of Calvin, and was but a compilation from the Genevan form. It contains the following passage:—"We do first therefore examine ourselves, according to St. Paul's rule, and prepare our minds that

* So Bertram or Rathram says, "If there be no figure in that mystery, it is not properly called a mystery." ("Concerning the Body and Blood of Jesus," p. 147. Edit. Dublin, 1753. See also pp. 150, 171, 174, 175—181, 182, 191.)

"Hoc sensu Sacramenta dicta sunt *mysteria* in Græca Ecclesia, quia ipsa quidem sunt res externæ et sensibus obviæ, sed eorum significatio arcana est, et non nisi ex verbo Dei cognosci potest." (Ursinus, in Works, vol. ii., p. 1381. Edit. Reuter, 1612.)

"Apud Theologos posteriores immutata fuit hujus nominis ratio, ac appellarunt Sacramentum signum illud sensibile, sub quo latet arcanum spirituale: arcanum vero id quod latet appellavere rem Sacramenti." (Gaspar Cantarini. Works, p. 331. Paris, 1571.) See also L. Arroque's History of the Eucharist. (Walker's Translation, 1684, pp. 257—260.) And Chamier's Panstrat. Cathol., tom. iv., p. 5; 1627.

we may be worthy partakers of *so high mysteries*." See Blakeney, Common Prayer, p. 191 and 438, note, who quotes from Bingham, "There is nothing more usual with the ancients than this way of speaking, to call every sacred rite and ceremony used in the Church by the name of sacrament or mystery." Thus, as Dr. Blakeney observes, "The word Μυστήριον signifies not only a thing hidden until revealed, but a *similitude*."

In answer to the argument that "the presence of our Saviour in the Eucharist" is confessed by English Divines "an ineffable mystery," Archbishop Wake replies thus, "Well, be it so; what will he hence infer? Why 'this he conceives is said to be so in respect of something in it OPPOSITE AND CONTRADICTORY TO, and therefore incomprehensible and ineffable by human reason.' But supposing they should *not* think it so from being *opposite* AND CONTRADICTORY *to*, but because the manner how Christ herein communicates himself to us is hid from, and above our human reason; might not this be sufficient to make it still be called an ineffable and incomprehensible mystery? Whereas the other would make it rather PLAIN AND COMPREHENSIBLE NONSENSE. It is a *strange affection* that some men have got of late for CONTRADICTIONS; they are so in love with them that they have *almost brought it to be the definition of a mystery*, to be the revelation of *something to be believed* IN OPPOSITION TO SENSE AND REASON." (Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 80.)

Of the Romish doctrine and its defence, Archbishop Secker says, "They must not say, this Doctrine is a Mystery. For there is no Mystery, no Obscurity in it: but it is as plainly seen to be an error, as anything else is seen to be a Truth. And the more so, because it relates, not to an infinite Nature, as God; but entirely to what is finite, a Bit of Bread and a human Body." (Lectures on Catechism, vol. ii., p. 246. Edit. 1769.)

"Is it not the case . . . that 'Holy Mysteries' did *not* mean holy *concealments*, but *showings forth*?" (Present Day Papers. The Eucharist, p. 14.) "I am afraid a spirit is abroad, to which there can be no greater recommendation of any doctrine, than that it shocks the common sense of mankind. . . . It must be remembered that in the present case the objection to the alleged *mystery* is, not that it is inscrutable, but that it is factitious, a creature of human speculation,

the product of an arbitrary and fanciful exegesis, disguised by an accumulation of unmeaning and mutually contradictory terms." (Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1869, p. 67. See also S. C. Malan on Ritualism, p. 99; and Turton on Eucharist, pp. 221, 222.)

It must not be supposed that thus there is eliminated from "These holy Mysteries" that which is really hidden and secret and passing man's understanding in the sacramental efficacy, and the Divine operation for the souls of the faithful, through the faith of the Gospel. (See Goulburn on Holy Communion, pp. 288—290. Bishop Bilson, True Difference, pp. 806, 807.)

Hospinian says, "Quinam fieri possit ut Christi carnem in cœlis nunc positam nos in terris positi, quamvis spiritualiter, vere tamen per fidem participemus, ut vivificum illud succum inde hauriamus, hoc captum nostrum superat et mysterium magnum est." (Concordia Discors. in Works, vol. v., p. 46, b.) The same view is frequently expressed by Calvin.

So Beza says, "Etsi enim scimus Spiritum Sanctum, id est, Dei virtutem hoc operari, et quod ad nos attinet, solo fidei instrumento id omne a nobis percipi, tamen et Spiritus potentia, et fidei efficacia nostrum omnem sensum exuperant: quo fit ut tota hæc actio valde propriè μυστήριον vocetur." (Tract: Theol., vol. i., p. 209. See also Beza as quoted above, Paper No. VI., p. 357; and Bishop Bayly's Practice of Piety, p. 445: Edit. 1668.)

Note R, p. 451.

"That phrase, the Lord's Supper, being the phrase most commonly employed by the Church of England to describe the second of the two great Christian sacraments, might sufficiently express the exact ground assumed by the English Reformers, for the word 'Supper' involves the question at issue. The doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, as is now the fashion to call it, they resisted. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper they maintained. For the general fact I call an impartial witness. The Dean of Chichester, in his life of Archbishop Cranmer, says:—'Protestants of all shades of opinion were united

on this one point, that the Mass should be turned into a Communion. The Mass was regarded as a sacrifice of our Lord for the quick and the dead. This the Reformers, one and all, denied. They maintained that it was a Communion, through which the faithful were united to God; and that the sacrifice was the offering of themselves, their souls and bodies, to God's service, in common with the hosts of heaven.' Now it is this idea of a Communion, a common participation, which is expressed in the word 'Supper.' The title as I have used it, consequently involves all the questions in dispute." (Mr. Garbett's Lecture, "The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper the Keynote of the English Reformation," p. 11.)

"But the word *Missa*, as it is used at present among the Papists, for a true and proper Sacrifice of Christ offered in every celebration for the living and the dead is never used among the Ancients. And for this Reason the name of *Missa* or *Mass* is rejected by the Church of England, which having EXPLODED the Opinion of the SACRIFICE of the MASS, does DISCLAIM the use of the Word MISSA in Modern, though not in the Ancient Sense. Indeed in the First Edition of the Common Prayer Book under Edward the Sixth, the name of the Mass (as the Liturgy was then commonly called) was retained. But when men who were leavened with the Doctrine of the Papists detorted it to a wrong sense, it seemed good to the Bishops, that in the Second Edition of the Liturgy it should be omitted." (From Bishop Cosin's notes communicated by Dr. Pickering in Nicholl's Additional Notes to Common Prayer, p. 36. See his notes also in pp. 45, 48, 50, 51, 53. See also Cosin's Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. v., pp. 301, 302.)

Note S, p. 452.

See note on No. i., pp. 31-2. In the Canons sanctioned by Convocation in 1640 (see Collier's Ecclesiastical History, viii., pp. 181—188) is the following: "We declare that the situation of the holy table doth not imply that it is, or ought to be esteemed a *proper altar*, whereon Christ is again really sacrificed; but it is *and may be called*

an altar by us, *in that sense* in which the primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other." (See Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., p. 405, and Humphry's "Student's Common Prayer," pp. 124-5, and Andrewes's Minor Works. Oxford Edit., p. 20.)

In Tracts for the Times, No. 86, the changes in our Services made by our Reformers are regarded as "a taking from us of part of our ancient inheritance—a withdrawal of our higher privileges—a thrusting us aside, and bidding us to take the *lower place*, the position of suppliants, and to 'weep between the porch and the altar. And in this sense, the substitution of the term '*Table*,' 'Holy *Table*,' etc., for that of 'Altar,' is a strong instance of this our judicial humiliation. For what is this but to say, that the higher mysteries, which the word 'Altar' represents, are partially withdrawn from view?" (See Essays on the Church, p. 152. See also Cudworth's Discourse concerning Lord's Supper, ch. v., pp. 27, 28; Edit. 1676.)

Note T, p. 453.

Compare the following:—"We believe that, as in heaven, Christ, our Great High Priest, ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading by His presence His Sacrifice of Himself once offered on the cross; so on earth, in the Holy Eucharist, that same body, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same blood, once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the Priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in Remembrance of Himself, when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament of His body and blood." (Declaration of the twenty-one Priests.)

On this portion of the Declaration, the following remarks may be commended to the reader's careful attention.

"To all . . . that possibly can be advanced, in support of the proposition that Christ our Lord renews His offering of Himself, it might be sufficient to say, that St. Paul* knew all (to say the least)

* Præstat Apostolum de Sacrificio Christi disputantem audire. Ille enim nobis omnem facile scrupulum eximet ex animo. Ille igitur primùm instituens comparationem inter Sacrificium Christi et Sacrificium Aaronicum, ait sub lege necesse fuisse sacrificium offerre καθ' ἡμέραν, Christo verò nihil opus esse id facere, quia id præstitit ἐφάπαξ.

that we can possibly know concerning the nature of our Lord's sacrificial acts in heaven, and concerning the conditions of His Human Personality. And yet he, knowing these things, *distinctly denies* any iteration of the offering of Christ Himself, and no less distinctly *affirms the* UNITY, and *ever-enduring efficacy*, of THAT OFFERING." (Rev. W. B. Marriott in correspondence with Rev. T. T. Carter. Rivingtons. Part i., pp. 53-4.)

"In all Scripture, 'nothing is said' of any prolongation of the one act of oblation. How, therefore, can we be justified in deciding, upon imperfect analogies founded on the symbols of the Levitical system, that the oblation of Christ Himself was 'prolonged,' and is now being prolonged or perpetuated (as an act) of which Holy Scripture DECLARES *with the utmost possible emphasis*, that it was ONCE *made, in* PAST *time*, and ONCE FOR ALL?" (Ibid. Part ii., p. 66, note.)

"Bingham* shows that the word *sacrificium* was anciently applied to the entire service as applicable to the spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise, and other devotions. Bingham says, '*Every part* of divine worship had the *name of sacrifice*, and *not only* the service of the *altar*. For they commonly call their evening hymns and prayers by the name of the evening sacrifice.'" (Blakeney's Common Prayer, p. 312.)

It may be added that Bingham declares of the "power to offer Christ's body and blood REALLY *upon the altar*, as a propitiatory

Heb. vii. 27. Quod qua ratione ab eo dici potuerit haud equidem intelligo, si quotidie Christi sacrificium iterandum est. Quid enim? Hoccine *vitiosum* fuit *per se* in sacrificiis legalibus quod tam sæpe repetita sunt? Id si ita est, *vitium idem* in sacrificio Christi hæret. Ideone id reprehendit in sacrificiis legalibus, quia in iis imperfectionem virtutis et efficacitatis arguit? Id ipsum in sacrificio Christi Culpari potest."

(Syntagma Thesium Theologicarum in academia Salmuriensi disputatarum, sub præsidio Ludovi Capelli, Mosis Amyraldi. Part iii. Salmurii, 1665.)

* "Under which name [the Christian Sacrifice] first know, that the Ancient Church understood not, as many suppose, the *mere Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ;* but *the whole Sacred Action*, or Solemn Service of the Church assembled, whereof this Sacred Mystery was then a prime and principal part, and as it were the Pearl or Jewel of that Ring." (Mede's Works, p. 356. Edit. 1677.)

[It will be understood, I hope, that extracts given in these notes from the writings of Mede and others, who have been appealed to as teachers of the Eucharistic sacrifice in former years, are not introduced for the sake of misleading the reader, and giving a one-sided view of their doctrine; but (partly at least) for the sake of shewing, how entirely distinct is the teaching of those who *were* regarded as teachers of high sacrificial doctrine from the teaching of those who now maintain the Real Objective Presence.]

sacrifice for the quick and dead" that it is "such a notion of the Christian priesthood as no *ancient author or ritual ever mentions.*" (Antiquities. Book ii., c. xix., Lect. xv., vol. i., p. 269.)

"We with the ancient Fathers assert and teach, that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, among the ancients there was no* other oblation made for the Living and the Dead, but only that the Priest or Presbyter standing before the holy Table, prayed to God for them for the sake of Christ, and Christ's Passion and Death." (From Bishop Cosin's notes, communicated by Dr. Pickering, in Nicholls's Additional Notes, p. 51.)

Courayer quotes from St. Augustine the words "Hujus Sacrificii Caro et Sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur, post adscensum Christi per *Sacramentum Memoriæ* celebratur:" and then he adds (and the statement as coming from a Roman Catholic†

* "Blood, *unbloodily* shed? You speak monsters, M. Hart, unless you mean by [unbloodily] not *truly*, and *in deed*, but *sacramentally*. For then you say well, that His blood is shed, when we show His death, and remember the shedding of it. . . . . This is the most that you can make of the Fathers, although it be granted that they called their celebrating of the Lord's Supper an *unbloody sacrifice* in respect of the bloody sacrifice of Christ which he offered on the cross. Much less make they for you, if they called it not so in respect of *His* sacrifice, but of the sacrifice of the Jews. Which is the more likely that they did, because they called their prayers and their very worship of God *unbloody* too: no doubt to distinguish it from the Jewish worship, which offered bloody sacrifices. For as Saint Paul . . . calleth it *reasonable*. . . . so the Fathers called it *reasonable and unbloody*, to the same effect." (Summe of Conference between John Rainolds and John Hart, pp. 537, 538. London, 1598.)

"Suarez the Jesuit denies any proper breaking of the body in the Mass. . . . Besides, the Church of Rome hath left out of her Mass the word (*broken*) used in the Institution; and Jansenius, a Papist, gives the reason why it is left out, *Ne esset locus absurdæ intelligentiæ, qua quis existimare possit vere frangi Corpus Christi;* that is, lest any should absurdly think, that Christ's body could be truly broken. And as to any proper shedding of blood in the Eucharist, Bellarmine himself disowns it: saith he, *Sanguis Christi in Missa non reipsa egreditur de corpore.* . . . . . And this is as much as any Protestant can say, in dissolving this Argument; for if *breaking*, and *shedding of blood* in the Supper, is to be taken improperly, then is the Supper but an improper Figurative Sacrifice, representative of the true proper sacrifice, which we Protestants grant." (Mornin Exercise against Popery, pp. 809, 810. London, 1675.)

† See also Bishop of Condom as quoted in Hickes's Treatises, vol. iii., p. 263. "Plerique Pontificii statuunt, *Missam esse sacrificium externum, visibile, proprie sic dictum, adeoque propitiatorium.* Sed Gropperus. . . . . Wicelius, Sidonius. . . . . *Missam tantum pro repræsentatiro et commemoratire sacrificio habendam esse* docuerunt." (Gerhard's *Confessio Catholica*, ii., p. 1018. Jena, 1661.)

is most observable) "It is thus that the greater part of the ancient Fathers have expressed themselves. . . . . St. Ignatius, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and so many others, do not acknowledge a Sacrifice in the celebration of our Mysteries in any other sense; which led St. Ambrose to say, that Jesus Christ really offers Himself for us in heaven to His Father, but that upon our altars *He is offered* ONLY IN IMAGE: *Hic in imagine, ibi in veritate.*" (On English Orders, Oxford Edit., pp. 224, 225. See S. C. Malan's "The Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," pp. 65—109.)

The following is from Bishop Bilson:—"*Philander* [Jesuit] As though the ancient fathers did not also say that Christ is daily offered in the Church. *Theophilus* [Christian] NOT IN the SUBSTANCE, which is*

"Dicunt, *Christi sacrificium non tantum verbis, sed et simili actione, puta Missali sacrificio*, quod tamen idem cum crucis sacrificio sit, *debere repræsentari.* At si Missa est tantum repræsentatio ac similitudo sacrificii Christi in ara crucis oblati, quomodo identitas sacrificii crucis et sacrificii Missatici, quam Concilium Tridentinum statuit, locum habebit?" (Ibid, p. 1022.)

* "Christ is offered in this Sacred Supper, not Hypostatically, as the Papists would have Him (for so He was but once offered) but *commemoratively* only. . . . That this, and no other, offering of Christ in the blessed Eucharist the Ancient Church ever meant or intended, I am now to shew by authentical Testimonies. . . . . In a word, The Sacrifice of Christians is nothing but that one Sacrifice of *Christ*, once offered on the cross, again and again commemorated." (Mede's Works, pp. 376, 378. Edit. 1677.)

"Passio domini est (ut inquit Cyprianus) sacrificium quod offerimus, id est, quod offerendo representamus, memores illius unici et summi sacrificii, et sanctæ immolationis in cruce factæ. Immolatur ergo Christus in altari, sed sacramentaliter et mystice, quia in sacramento recordatio illius fit, quod factum est semel." ("Euchiridion Christianæ institutionis" printed with "Canones Concil: Prov: Coloniensis, sub Reverendiss: D. Hermanno Archiepis: anno 1536." Fo. cvi. a. Colo: 1538.)

"Immolatio quæ manibus sacerdotis fit, Christi passio vocatur, non rei veritate, sed significandi mysterio, nec hac immolatione majis quam esu corporis dominici occiditur Christus." (Ibid, fo. cvi., a.)

"I have already produced the testimonies where the fathers make what is distributed in the Eucharist to be without life or sense, which can be true of nothing else but of the bread and wine. . . . . The same is also evidently proved from another common assertion of the fathers, 'that Christ offered the same oblation with Melchizedec.' St. Cyprian, lib. ii., Epist. 3, 'Quis magis sacerdos Dei summi, quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedec obtulerat, id est *panem et vinum*, suum scilicet corpus et sanguinem.' *Which indeed the wine and bread was* BY REPRESENTATION; but if you understand this of *proper flesh and blood* offered in the Eucharist, then *it is* NOT *the same oblation* with that of Melchisedec." (*Full view of the Doctrines and Practices of the Ancient Church relating to the Eucharist*, pp. 101—103, said to be written by Bishop Patrick, see Hickes's Treatises, vol. iii., pp. 263, 264. Angl.-Cath. Lib.)

your ERROR, but *in* SIGNIFICATION, which is THEIR *doctrine and* OURS. Take their interpretation with their words, and they make nothing for your local and external offering of Christ. . . . . 'What other thing,' saith Prosper, 'is thereby designed, than the offering of the Lord's body on the cross, and the shedding of His blood from His side? . . . Then if the death of Christ be the sacrifice which the Church offereth, it is evident that Christ is not only *sacrificed* at this table, but also *crucified;* and crucified in the self-same sort and sense that He is sacrificed; but no man is so mad as to defend that Christ is *really* put to death in these mysteries: *ergo* neither is He *really* sacrificed under the forms of bread and wine: which thing yourselves have lately ventered and rashly presumed without all antiquity. The Catholic Fathers I can assure you say, *Christ is offered* and Christ *is crucified* in the Lord's Supper indifferently." (Bishop Bilson, True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion, Edit. 1585, pp. 690, 691.)

"The contradiction of the Trent Fathers is here very remarkable. 'Christ,' say they, 'who, on the altar of the cross, offered Himself in

"Of all the Early Fathers, none, perhaps, are so full and emphatic on the *sacrificial* character of the Eucharist as Cyprian . . . [after quotation.] The purport of this passage is to represent the Eucharist as a *commemorative* sacrifice, and nothing more. And the same is expressed in another paragraph of the same letter still more unequivocally." (Professor J. J. Blunt on the Early Fathers, pp. 461, 462.)

"The Fathers named their offering, a sacrifice, not properly but by a figure: meaning the death of Christ (our only very, sovereign, true, and proper sacrifice) to be represented there, in a mystery, not executed in deed. . . . So doth Cyprian treat of the offering of Christ. . . . . So doth Chrysostom. . . . . So the same Ambrose. . . . So Austin . . . . Finally Eusebius (who may serve also to declare the judgment of the Council of Nice, whereof he was a part) doth by the very name of unbloody sacrifices witness his agreement therein with the rest. For he calleth our remembrances and representations of the death of Christ in celebrating the sacraments of His body and blood, though sacrifices, for the likeness: yet unbloody, for the difference: to show that Christ is not sacrificed in them truly and properly (for then must His blood be shed, as it was, when He suffered death) but only by way of a sacrament, and mystery, wherein the true sacrifice is set forth before us, and remembered by us." (The Summe of the Conference between John Rainolds and John Hart, p. 536. London, 1598.)

"This was one reason why the Ancients called the action a sacrifice . . . because it doth represent the Sacrifice which Christ once offered. It is a figure of His Death which we commemorate, unto which the Apostle St. Paul (as a learned man conceives) hath a reference, when he saith to the Galatians, that *Jesus Christ was set forth evidently before their eyes, crucified among them.* They saw (as it were) His Sacrifice on the cross, it was so lively figured in this Sacrament." (Bishop Patrick's Mensa Mystica, p. 14. London, 1717.)

a bloody sacrifice, is now this true propitiatory Sacrifice in the Mass, made by Himself. He is one and the same sacrifice; and one and the same offerer of that sacrifice, by the ministry of His priests, who then offered Himself on the cross.' So then, they say, that Christ offered up that sacrifice then, and this now: St. Paul says He offered up *that sacrifice*, and NO MORE. St. Paul says our High Priest needs not to offer daily sacrifice: they say these daily sacrifices must be offered by Him. St. Paul says, that He offered Himself but once for the sins of the people: they say He offers Himself daily for the sins of quick and dead. And, if the Apostle, in the spirit of prophecy, foresaw this error, and would purposely forestall it, he could not speak more directly, than when he saith, *We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all*, etc., etc. (Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 259. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)*

* "Christus illic tantum offertur, ubi patitur, sanguinem effundit, moritur: hæc enim æquipollent. Probatur. Nam Paulus Hebr: 9 sic inquit: Neque ut sæpe offerat semetipsum, etc., alioquin oportebat eum frequenter pati ab origine mundi. Ergo offerre Christum est pati Christum: nam Paulus Christi oblationem hinc probat unicam esse oportere, quod semel tantum est mactatus. Ergo illic solum offertur, ubi moritur: nam oblatio mortem sequitur. Tunc enim perficitur oblatio, quum id quod offertur occisum est.

Christus non potest ultra mori, pati, sanguinem fundere. Ro. 6. Christus qui resurrexit a mortuis, ultra non moritur, mors illi ultra non dominatur, nam quod mortuus est, peccato mortuus est, et hoc semel: quod autem vivit, vivit Deo.

Ergo Christus ultra offerri non potest, mori enim non potest.

Nunc te hujus admoneo, ne mihi ullas istarum propositionum inexcussam transilias. Id si feceris, nunquam ex sacramento Eucharistiæ oblationem facies, etiam si patrum testimonia terra marique advehas."

("Adversus Hieronymum Emserum Canonis Missæ assertorem Huldrychi Zuinglii Antibolon." Zurich, Christopher Froschover, 1523. Under "Missa"—"Secundo sic accipe" i., ii., iii. The book is without pagination.)

"Christus semel se pro nobis *obtulit:* id est, semel pro nobis mortuus est. Nam hoc est offere, ut Christus oblatus est. Et nos dicimus per manum sacerdotis semper offerri. Quod si verum est, et illud verum esse oportet: Christum per sacerdotis manum semper mori." (Oswald Myconius, *Ad Sacerdotes Helvetiæ suasoria*, p. 18; Zurich, 1523.)

Note U, p. 453.

The animus of this change is yet more striking when viewed in connexion with just the same process taking place in the Ordinal. Our Reformers were wont to argue against the Sacrifice of the Mass, from the silence of Scripture, adverting, sometimes, especially to the fact of the Pastoral Epistles containing nothing of what (in the Romish view) is the highest work of the Christian ministry.

We may argue that our Prayer Book is, in this as in other matters also, like the Scriptures. And we may ask of the Prayer Book as a whole, where is one word of the mass, either name or thing? And we may specially advert to our Ordinal, containing a long and very solemn address touching those matters which pertain to the office to the Christian ministry; and ask where is one word of offering sacrifice?

And not only so; but we must direct special attention to the fact that this perfect silence in the Ordinal, like the silence in our Communion Service, comes of the CLEARING work of our Reformers. Once that was conspicuously present, which now (thanks to the Reformation) is conspicuously absent. Dr. Blakeney writes:—

"The Mediæval Ordinal contained the following passages. I give the translation:—

'It belongeth to a priest *to offer*.'

How did the Reformers deal with this? They struck it out.

'Bless and sanctify, O Lord, these hands of thy priests in the consecration of hosts which they shall offer for the sins and negligences of the people.'

How did the Reformers deal with this? They struck it out.

'Receive power *to offer sacrifice* to God, and to *celebrate Mass* for the living as well as for the dead.'

How did the Reformers deal with this? They struck it out.

'The blessing of God the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit descend upon you, that you may be blessed in the sacerdotal order, and in the offering of propitiatory sacrifices.'

How did the Reformers deal with this? They struck it out." (Dr. Blakeney, "Mass in the Church of England," p. 20.)

These omissions were made in the Ordinal of 1549, in which, how-

ever, was still retained the delivery of the chalice or cup with the bread. (See Liturgies of Edward, P. S. Edit., p. 179.)

In 1552 this was omitted also, and only the delivery of the Bible retained.

Let the exhortation in our Reformed office for "the ordering of Priests" be compared with the "Admonitio ad Sacerdotes" of the Sarum Ordinal, which may be seen in Maskell's Monumenta Ritualia, vol. iii., pp. 233—236.

Our Reformers were fully justified in making these omissions.

In the Eastern Church "it will be specially remarked that there is neither unction of the head nor hands; nor any *traditio instrumentorum*. It also cannot fail to be noticed that there is nothing which strictly corresponds with the 'Accipe potestatem offere sacrificium Deo, missas que celebrare, tam pro vivis, quam pro defunctis,' of the Roman Pontifical. The only direct reference to the subject of sacrifice occurs in the prayer 'O God, mighty in power, and unsearchable in wisdom,' in which the expression is προσφέρειν σοι δῶρα καί θυσίας πνευματικὰς, 'to offer unto Thee gifts and spiritual sacrifices.'" (Dr. F. G. Lee's Validity of Holy Orders, pp. 104, 105.)

"The most ancient forms of ordination which exist, common to both Orientals and Occidentals, are those which simply direct the consecrator to lay on his hands, at the same time that he uses a prayer or prayers supplicating the grace of the Spirit of God on behalf of the person ordained." (Ibid, p. 91.)

"Where has he learnt that the Priesthood is conferred by the formula which expresses the power to sacrifice? There is not a single word said of it in the Ancient Orders of Service, no more than in the Euchologies and Rituals of the Greeks, the Syrians, the Copts, and generally speaking of all the Orientals. On this subject may be consulted the collection of Father Martene, and it will there be seen, that it is only since the eleventh century that we find the formula 'Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass as well for the living as for the dead, in the name of the Lord': a formula which has been drawn in only by the ceremony of the Chalice and the Paten; and independently of which the Priests were formerly very validly consecrated in the Latin, and are still at this day in the Eastern Church." (Courayer on English Orders, Oxford Edit., pp. 220, 221. See also, pp. 216, 217, 96, 98, 100, 106, 109—116.

And Walcott on English Ordinal, pp. 252—257; also, Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 594, 595.)

It has been declared by a Roman Pontiff (Pope Innocent IV.) "formas sacramentorum post Apostolos esse inventas et ab Ecclesiâ ordinatas. De ritu Apostolico invenitur in Epist: ad Timotheum quod manum imponebant ordinandis, et orationem fundebant, aliam autem formam non legimus ab eis servatam, unde credimus quod nisi essent formæ postea adinventæ, sufficeret ordinatori dicere *sis Sacerdos* vel alia æquipollentia verba: sed subsequentibus temporibus formas quæ servantur Ecclesia ordinavit." (See Du Pin "De antiquâ Ecclesiæ Disciplinâ," p. 354. Edit. Paris, 1686.)

But the full justification of these omissions, as of the corresponding changes in our Communion Service,* rests upon the authority of God's word, by which our Reformers learnt to condemn the sacrifices of Masses as "blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

"Vos aliud cerebri vestri figmentum adjecistis, potestatem scilicet offerendi sacrificium propriè dictum, et propriè *propitiatorium* pro vivis et defunctis. In qua fieri non potest, ut vos Apostolis succedatis, cum nec ipsi (ut postea liquebit) tales fuerint Sacerdotes, nec ullum unquam istiusmodi Sacerdotium posteris tradiderint." (Mason's Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Lib. 2, cap. i., p. 59. Edit. 1625.)

"Primo, panem dedisse legimus, patinam tradidisse non legimus. Secundo, calicem præbuit quidem, sed ab libendum, non, (ut vos) ad sacrificandum. Vestra igitur porrectio in Christi facto fundari non

* "One thing is certain,—that the more sacrificial the general tenour of any Liturgy is, the more confused and inconsistent with itself it is, and this confusion culminates in the most Sacrificial of all Liturgies, the Roman." (Saddler in "The Church and the Age," p. 293.)

The following are the words of Luther—"Nec quid commodemus illis, vocabulum sacrificium in Canone tolerantes, video, Cum Canon Missam nullo alio vocabulo quam sacrificio depingat atque describat, ita ut omnes oculati videant et fateri cogantur, Missam esse sacrificium. Inter cætera enim, hæcquoque verba expresse ponuntur, ut Deus ejusmodi Sacramenti Sacrificium, per manus Sacrosancti Angeli sui ad thronum et sedem Majestatis Divinæ perferri jubeat, quod licet torqueant, et glossis suis, ut volent, emolliant: tamen intelligi locus iste non potest de memoria aut recordatione Christi, id quod per conciones fieri necesse est. An vero huic blasphemiæ subscribemus, quæ in Eodem Canone rogatur et petitur, ut Deus hostiam sanguinis ac carnis Christi gratam habeat, quasi vero Christo apud Patrem suum cœlestem Sacrificuli intercessione et deprecatione opus sit? Quod eum sit dictu et auditu horrendum, quanam Conscientia in tam fœdam Christi contumeliam consentiremus?" (Luther in "Historia Comitiorum M.D.XXX. Augustæ Celebratorum." Frankfort-on-Oder, 1597, vol. iii., fos. 53, 54.)

potest. . . . Spiritus Sanctus solius meminit *Impositionis manuum*, nequæ ullius præterea cæremoniæ, in Episcoporum ordinatione ab Apostolis adhibitæ, uspiam in Scripturis fit mentio: cum hac tamen manuum impositione, gratiam ordinato collatum esse testatur Spiritus sanctus. Hanc igitur, ut signum ordinis sensibile, et Symbolum gratiæ amplectimur: reliquas vero cæremonias, humano ingenio excogitatas, tanto honore non dignamur: hanc gloriam (quanta quanta est) sola Impositio manuum suo sibi quasi jure vindicat." (Mason's Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, lib. ii., c. 15, p. 218. See also Pearson's Minor Theological Works, vol. i., pp. 291—299; Edit. Churton, 1844.)

Note V, see p. 454.

"The blessed Sacrament," says Jeremy Taylor, "is the same thing now as it was in the institution of it; but Christ did not really give His natural body in the natural sense, when He ate His last supper; therefore, neither does He now. The first proposition is, beyond all dispute, certain, evident, and confessed. *Hoc facite* convinces it. '*This do*': what Christ did, His disciples are to do. I assume Christ did not give His natural body properly in the Last Supper, therefore neither does He now. The assumption I prove by divers arguments.

"First, if He then gave His natural body, then it was naturally broken, and His blood was actually poured forth before His passion. . . . Now these words were spoken either properly and naturally (and then they were not true, because His body was yet whole, His blood still in the proper channels); or else it was spoken in a figurative and sacramental sense, and so it was true (as all the words which our blessed Saviour spoke); for that which He then ministered was the Sacrament of His passion.

"Secondly, if Christ gave His body in the natural sense at the Last Supper, then it was either a sacrifice propitiatory, or it was not;—if it was not, then it is not now, and then their dream of the Mass is vanished; if it was propitiatory at the Last Supper, then God was reconciled to the world, and mankind was redeemed before the passion of our blessed Saviour, which therefore would have been needless and

ineffectual; SO FEARFUL ARE THE CONSEQUENCES OF THIS STRANGE DOCTRINE." (Bishop Jeremy Taylor's "Real Presence," Sect. vii., 1; vol. vi., pp. 66, 67.)

It was hotly disputed (according to Sarpi) at the Council of Trent, whether or not Christ offered himself in His Supper. One part said He did *not* offer; "and for proof hereof, they said that THE OBLATION OF THE CROSS *would have been* SUPERFLUOUS, because mankind *would have been* REDEEMED *by that of the Supper*, which went before." (Sarpi, Edit. 1576, p. 510.) The Bishop of Veglia "told them . . . . he that maintaineth a *propitiatory sacrifice* in the Supper, must needs confess that BY IT WE ARE REDEEMED, and NOT BY HIS DEATH." This Bishop, we are told, "persuaded so many, that it was almost the common opinion, not to make mention of *the propitiatory sacrifice* offered by Christ in the Supper." (Ibid, p. 519.) When the decree was passed declaring that Christ "corpus et sanguinem suum sub speciebus panis et vini Deo Patri obtulit," (Sessio xxii., caput 1,) "three and twenty bishops did contradict." (Ibid, p. 536.)

"It is impossible that the sacrament should be a very sacrifice. For neither the sacrifices of the law which prophesied the sacrificing of Christ, neither yet our redemption, was fulfilled that night. For if the Scriptures and prophecies were then fulfilled, and we then redeemed, Christ died on the morrow in vain. . . . . He bled as fresh on the morrow as He had bled then nothing at all. . . . . The sacrament was that night, no doubt, but a description of His passion to come; as it is now a memorial of His passion past." (Tyndale's Doctrinal Treatises, P. S. Edit., p. 371.)

"The suffering which He specified by the breaking of His body and shedding of His blood was not present, but the next day on the cross. If you teach that Christ's blood was really shed at the table for the remission of sins, you must put Him twice to death, and make the later death which was on the cross to be utterly idle. For where remission (of sin) is, there needeth no more sacrifice for sin. If the remission of sins were obtained by the actual shedding of Christ's blood at His last supper, His death and cross the next day were superfluous." (Bishop Bilson's "True Difference," etc., p. 676; Edit. 1585.)

"Their Jesuit Salmeron is permitted to write, that *the oblation of Christ in His last supper* (which the Romanists hold to have been

satisfactory and propitiatory)* *did not receive any efficacy or virtue from the sacrifice of the Cross.*" (Bishop Morton's "Catholic Appeal," lib. ii., ch. 7, sect. 17, p. 187; Edit. 1610.)

"You say we have renounced your sacrifice of the Mass. If the sacrifice of the Mass be the same with the sacrifice of the Cross, we attribute more unto it than yourselves; we place our whole hope of salvation in it. . . . . 'By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.' Surely you cannot think that Christ did actually sacrifice Himself at His last Supper (for then He had redeemed the world at His Last Supper; then His subsequent sacrifice upon the cross had been superfluous); nor that the priest now doth more than Christ did then." (Archbishop Bramhall: Works. Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. i., p. 54.)

"Christ himself did not sacrifice on the table, but on the cross: for, if the sacrifice which He offered in His supper were perfect and fully propitiatory, what needed He to die afterward? Wherefore was His blood shed upon the Cross, which (by His transubstantiated blood, not yet shed) had formerly redeemed the world? . . . . What can either be spoken or conceived, more plain than those words of God, *once offered, one sacrifice, one oblation?* . . . . We will remember this holy sacrifice of Christ, as Cassander well advises, and celebrate it with a thankful heart: we will not repeat it." (Bishop Hall: Works, vol. ix., p. 67; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

* Dr. George Hickes says of Prayer "that is propitiatory too" (Treatises, vol. i., p. 109, Ang.-Cath. Libr.); and so Cassander had spoken. (See Ibid, vol. iii., p. 278.) But such language, it seems to me, (*used in such connexion*) can only tend to make confusion in men's minds, and to draw together in men's conceptions, things which are (and should always be regarded as) as far distant as heaven from earth. If propitiation is a reality, which for its making demanded the Death and Blood-shedding of the Son of God, why should we desire to stretch the meaning of a word which belongs properly to His work (in its shadow before its accomplishment, but since in its reality alone) so as to cover and overlap the doings or offerings or eryings of the sinful and polluted worms of earth?

Bishop Bull says—"The meaning of it [the Trent proposition] must necessarily be this, that in the Eucharist the very body and blood of Christ are again offered up to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. Which is an impious profanation, derogatory to the one full satisfaction of Christ made by His death on the cross, and contrary to express Scripture, (Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12, 15, 26, 28; x. 12, 14.) It is true the Eucharist is frequently called by the ancient fathers προσφορὰ, θυσία, 'an oblation,' 'a sacrifice.' But it is to be remembered, that they say also it is θυσία λογικὴ καὶ ἀναίμακτος, 'a reasonable sacrifice,' 'a sacrifice without blood:' which, how can it be said to be, if therein the very blood of Christ were offered up to God?" (See Hickes's Treatises, vol. iii., p. 267; Angl.-Cath. Lib. And Bull's Works, vol. ii., p. 251. Oxford, 1846. See also Veron, as quoted in "Is Healthful Reunion Impossible?" pp. 88, 89.)

"That which Cassander cites: . . . . 'Surely, if we offer daily, it is done for a recordation of His death.' This is the language and meaning of an iquity." (Ibid, p. 258.)

"But further—did our Saviour at His first Sacrament really offer up Himself—body and blood and life—a true, proper sacrifice to God, or did He not? If He did not, how shall we dare to pretend to offer Him up in our sacraments? If He did, as the Papists say He did, to what purpose did He afterwards offer himself up upon the cross?" (Archbishop Sharp's Works, Edit. Oxford, 1829, vol. v., p. 199.)

"Christ can be no more offered, as the doctors and priests of the Roman party fancy it to be, and vainly think that every time they say Mass they offer up and sacrifice Christ anew, as properly and truly as He offered up Himself in His sacrifice upon the cross. And this* is one of the points of doctrine, and the CHIEF ONE, whereof the *Popish Mass* consisteth, ABROGATED *and* REFORMED *here by the Church*

* This is no question at all of whether or not the Church of Rome thinks or acknowledges her doctrine to be derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

Did any one ever suppose that she *professed* to teach that which would make void the Saviour's work? Who ever expected her to plead *guilty* to such a charge?

But it is a question of whether or not the doctrine of the Church of Rome *does* derogate from the one perfect sacrifice of Christ.

Neither is it at all a question of whether or not her doctrine has been explained away by some and disclaimed by others among her Theologians.

But it is a question of whether or not the Romish doctrine of Sacrifice of the Mass *in its integrity*, and the Scriptural doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Cross *in its integrity* can stand together without collision, can be accepted and held together without being mutually destructive.

Whatever answer may be given to *this* question in our day, there can be no doubt as to the answer which our Reformers gave: and as little, I think, *should* there be as to the answer which our Church gives.

To say that the doctrine condemned by our Church in Article xxxi., cannot be the real Romish doctrine, because the doctrine *there* condemned is a doctrine derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross, is obviously to beg the whole question. Nay, is it not much more, is it not much the same as saying that we are looking at the Romish doctrine from her own point of view, and not from that of our Reformed Church? Proposals for Peace, from such a stand-point, we may not listen to.

"For us," says Bishop Hall, "as we would save our souls, let us carefully preserve them from the contagion of Romish superstition. Let us never fear, that our discretion can hate error too much. Let us awaken our holy zeal to a serious and fervent opposition, joined with a charitable endeavour of reclamation.

Shortly, let us hate their opinions, strive against their practice, pity their misguiding, neglect their censures, labour their recovery, pray for their salvation." (Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 300. Edit. Pratt, 1808.) See "Word for Warning and Defence of the Church of England, pp. 24 and 29." (Macintosh.)

of England, according to the express word of God. . . . . Without shedding of His blood, and killing Him over again, no proper sacrifice can be made of Him; which yet in their Masses the Roman priests pretend every day to do."* (Notes "supposed to be made

* "The Catholic Fathers," writes Bishop Bilson, "say Christ is offered and Christ is crucified in the Lord's Supper indifferently." (True Difference, p. 691.)

Herbert Thorndike says—"When it is said there [in the Council of Trent, cap. ii.], '*Quod in Missa* . . . . Christus . . . . incruentè immolatur,'—if it be meant properly, it is a contradiction; for that *which hath blood* is NOT SACRIFICED *but by shedding the blood of it*;—if figuratively, it signifies no more than that which I have said,—that it is represented, commemorated, and offered, as slain." (Thorndike's Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. v., p. 615.)

It is said by Gaspar Contarini that we *offer* CHRIST and we *offer* HIS PASSION. His words are—"Missa est sacrificium laudis, est sacrificium gratiarum actionis, est sacrificium, quia est memoria unici illius sacrificii, quo Christus se pro nobis obtulit patri, per Spiritum Sanctum, est autem sacrificium, quia est oblatio, *qua offerimus Christum, ejusque passionem*, ut inquit Augustinus in decimo de civitate Dei, et totam Ecclesiam per Christum Deo omnipotenti, ut ei inhæreamus per Christum, tanquam supremo omnium bono." (Gaspar Contarini's *Catechesis*, in Works, p. 536; Paris, 1571.)

Now if this offering of Christ in the Eucharist is in such sense *real (and not only representative)*, that for this offering of Christ it is needful that His *body and blood* should be *present* REALLY *(and not only representatively)*, then it follows that for the offering of His *Passion*, that *Passion* must also be *present* REALLY *(and not only representatively)*.

But "the act of sacrificing Christ upon the Cross . . . . is a thing consisting of motion and action; and can be *no more repeated, than the present time can become the present time another time*." (Herbert Thorndike's Works, Edit. Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. v., p. 547.)

Yet it is not easy to see how the following out of the Romish doctrine of the Mass, and of the Romish principles of interpretation on which that doctrine rests, can be made to stop short of this.

"By this doctrine, Christ's body was really and actually dead upon the cross, and so present under the accidents of bread and wine, when at the first Institution and Administration of the Lord's Supper He said, 'This is my body *given* or *broken for you*.' And also . . . . His body must be dead upon the Cross, and as so dead must be locally and corporally present in the Lord's Supper. . . . . Moreover, it must also follow from this doctrine, that the very material Cross on which Christ was crucified, and all the Instruments of His death, must be locally and corporally present at the Lord's Supper, and the very soldier that pierced Him must be there: . . . . yea, the very hour of His Death, though so many years past, and the place of His death, so many miles distant, must be present in every time and place the Lord's Supper is administered." (Morning Exercise against Popery," p. 739; London, 1675.)

Even *some such* contradictions as these (or something very like them), rejected and repudiated by Romanists themselves (however deducible from their teaching), appear to have been accepted by some, at least, of the Lutherans; who even regarded their denial by Papists as only defensible upon Zuinglian principles, and as being in fact a real support to Zuinglian arguments and to the cause of the Sacramentaries.

Witness the following:—"Quod in decimo articulo dixerunt, si modo inibi factum est,

from the Collections of Bishop Overall, by a Friend or Chaplain of his," in Nicholls's Additional Notes, p. 46; really Bishop Cosin's.)

"Turning to the explanation of the Article [Art. xxxi.] given in Tract 90, and lately repeated by Mr. Medd and Mr. Stuart, by the former in somewhat different terms, according to which the Article was pointed at a popular misapprehension as to the nature of the sacrifice, I think that the common prevalence of such an error, especially as it is described by Mr. Medd, has been too hastily assumed without proof, which perhaps it would be difficult to produce. But it is more important to observe that Mr. Newman, when he had spoken of the Mass 'being viewed as independent or distinct from the Sacrifice on the cross, appears to treat these two expressions, 'independent of' and 'distinct from,' as synonymous, and as conveying a meaning which he calls 'blasphemy.' But there is a very wide difference between the two things. To view the Mass as independent of the Sacrifice of the cross, would indeed be a very gross error; but until I see some proof, I shall continue utterly to disbelieve that it is one into which any worshipper at the Mass, even

corpus Christi sine sanguine et sanguinem sine corpore esse non posse, plane est rejiciendum ac repudiandum, si quidem nugæ et fabulæ ipsorum cum primo fidei nostræ articulo, qui *Deum omnipotentem* adserit et confitetur, manifeste et ex diametro pugnant.

Deus igitur cum sit omnipotens corpus sine sanguine, et sanguinem sine corpore nobis præbere potest, vivo nihilominus Christo, et salva corporis ac sanguinis ejus substantia.

Secundo, Zuinglii et Carolostadii errorem hoc ipso confirmant. Si enim caro sanguisque Christi distinctè in cœna nobis offerri et exhiberi non possunt, *multo minus simul et semel in diversis locis esse poterunt*, si quidem multo *magis naturæ est contrarium, simul et semel in diversis locis esse*, quam hoc, quod nobis corpus solum et sanguis solus distribuatur." ("Apologia Osiandri contra Articulos a Pontificiis Exhibitos," in "Cælestini Historia Comitiorum MDXXX. Augustæ Celebratorum," vol. iii., fo. 86*b*; Frankfort on Oder, 1597.)

Those who are disposed to think that in such matters of faith God is exalted, and His word made honourable, by refusing to allow the evidence of our senses, and the intuitions of our common sense, to have any part whatever in the interpretation of the language of Scripture, may be asked to observe—

(1) How the Lord Himself has consecrated the evidence of our senses (and that in very matter of His bodily presence), when He said, "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." (See Goulburn on Office of the Holy Communion, p. 292.)

(2) How, in like manner, the testimony of our common sense (and that as to the very matter of the impossibility of the human body of Christ being in more than one place at one time) is assumed and consecrated by Revelation, in such words as those which declared, "He is not here, *for* He is risen;" "Ye have the poor always with you, but me ye have not always."

in the darkest ages, ever fell. But though not independent of, it might be viewed as distinct from, the Sacrifice on the cross; and so *it is* viewed, not by the ignorant and vulgar only, but by the Church of Rome. . . . . However correct Mr. Stuart may be in his view of what the Eucharistic Sacrifice should be, to avoid direct collision with the Thirty-first Article, he is certainly mistaken, if, when he says 'there is a real propitiatory sacrifice, *i.e.* victim, in the Eucharist, but there is no real *act* of propitiation,' he conceives himself (as the whole context appears to show) to be expounding and not directly contradicting the Roman doctrine of the Mass. For when, in Canon 1, De Sacrificio Missæ, the Council of Trent declares—'Si quis dixerit in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non sit aliud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari anathema sit'—it is certain that *sacrificium* does not mean the *victim*, but the *act*—the same act which in Canon iii. is declared to be an 'act of propitiation:' 'Si quis dixerit, Missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti [only a memorial] non autem propitiatorium, anathema sit.'" (Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1866, pp. 139, 140, 142, 143.)

Bellarmine distinctly says:—"Non res illa, sed *rei illius oblatio* propriè sacrificium est; sacrificium enim est *actio*, non res permanens." (De Missâ, lib. ii., cap. iv., p. 1054; Edit. Ingolstadt, 1601. See also p. 1036, lib. i., cap. xxvii.)

Mr. Saddler, therefore, is quite right, (I think) when he says "The Real Objective Presence may add intensity to the memorial act, but nothing to the idea of Sacrifice. A sacrifice is not a thing merely, no matter how precious or holy, but an action performed on that thing as well." (The Church and the Age, p. 279. See Forbes on Articles, vol. ii., pp. 615, 616.)

Note W., p. 454.

"Nowhere do the Apostles or the Apostolic Fathers use the term ἱερέυς for* priest in the Holy Catholic Church, but only πρεσβύτερος: and in this case the so-called APOSTOLIC LITURGIES are UTTERLY WORTHLESS as an authority. Even in the so-called Apostolic Canons, priests are never called ἱερεῖς, but πρεσβύτεροι. . . . . The Apostolic Liturgies of S. Peter, S. Matthew, S. John, etc., and that of S. James in particular, are quoted for the terms ἱερέυς and θυσία found there; but *no one can place any faith in them*, as they have been so interpolated as to leave†

* "The word [Priest] must yet have two meanings: the one πρεσβύτερος, the other of ἱερεὺς. Whereof the one is given by the Apostles: but doth not imply authority to sacrifice. The other doth imply authority to sacrifice: but is not given by the Apostles." (The Summe of the Conference between John Rainolds and John Hart, p. 464; London, 1598.)

"So exceedingly moderate and prudent was the Church, that in the seventh Canon, 1640, it abundantly cautions, lest those words [*priest and altar*] be used otherwise than in a *metaphorical* and *improper* attribution." (Puller's Moderation of the Church of England, p. 172; Edit. Eden.) "In Liturgia Anglicana habemus quidem Sacrificii nomen, offerendi verbum, etiam hostiæ mentionem, sed nihil magis adversatur Missatico sacrificio quam tota hæc oratio." (Ibid; Quotation from Rivet in Note.)

"We shall not find in all the Holy Scriptures, that the ministers of the New Testament be called either *Sacerdotes* or *Sacrifici*. For that is attributed wholly and only unto unto Christ. . . . . *Objectio.*—The priesthood after the fashion of Melchizedech is now extant. . . . . *Responsio.*—The history of the book of Genesis doth not record that Melchizedech offered bread and wine unto God, but that he brought forth bread and wine unto Abraham. . . . . St. Ambrose doth evidently say, that these things were offered to Abraham, and not unto God." (Bishop Alley's "Poor Man's Library," tom. ii., p. 36*b*, 37*a*; Edit. Day, 1565.)

"Whatsoever the Scripture speaketh of sacrifices by the Church now in the time of the Gospel, it maketh them spiritual. . . . . Therefore away with all real offerings *never mentioned by the Lord since the only sufficient sacrifice of His Son*. . . . . The Mass casteth upon our Saviour *the reproach that He is* NOT *the* ONLY PRIEST *of the New Testament* which so expressly taught of Him. (Heb. v. 6; vii. 24.) . . . . They say it is Christ that they offer, and yet they pray God to accept it; which is absurd. No Priest can do more in sacrificing for our sins than Christ did. But Christ could not offer Himself *without death*. Therefore no priest can do it." (Bishop Babington's Works, vol. ii. pp. 255, 256; London, 1615.)

† Dr. Daniel concludes his dissertation on the date of the *writing* of Liturgies, by saying, "Itaque ex Liturgiis Scriptis, quæ ætatem tulerunt, ne antiquissimæ quidem superant sæculum quintum et quartum. At cave confundas quod bene est distinguendum, aliud sane esse liturgiam componere, aliud eam literis consignare." (Codex Liturgicus, tom. iv., Fasciculus i., p. 31; Leipsic, 1853.)

"Primis Ecclesiæ sæculis sacros illos ritus sola traditione viguisse, extra controversiam esse debet." (Renaudot: Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio, tom. i., Dissertatio, p. iii.)

little of the original writing." (Malan's Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—Nutt, p. 106. See also Trevor's Sacrifice and Participation, pp. 141—144. Also Blakeney's Common Prayer, pp. 310—317; and especially the quotation from Dupin, pp. 314—316. And Goode on Eucharist, i., p. 439, sqq. Also Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, Appendix, No. 1, pp. 517—529; Edit. 1830.)

"In the terms ἐπισκοπος, 'bishop,' literally 'overseer,' and πρεσβύτερος, 'elder,' by which the presiding class in the Church is formally designated in Scripture, we find the strongest possible argument against the sacrificial doctrine in question. These titles were selected, the one from a civil office, the other from the synagogue or Sanhedrim —both from an exclusively lay source—as if on purpose to guard against the persons invested with them being confused with the Jewish priests. It matters little, however, whether we regard these terms in the meaning suggested by the sources from which they were borrowed, or in that suggested by themselves. In either case, they form the same continual protest against the doctrine of a sacrifice in the Holy Communion, involving the necessity of an order of priests (ἱερεῖς) for the purpose of offering it. And I think that the argument supplied by these words may be submitted to be itself decisive of the whole question." (Harris's Claims of the Priesthood, Parker, pp. 56, 37.)

The following quotation is worthy of special attention:—"The Apostles did indeed forbear such terms in their speeches concerning Christian worship, whereof these your forenamed disputers can give us a reason, *Lest that* (they say) *the Jewish Priesthood being as yet in force, Christians might seem, by using Jewish terms, to innovate Jewish rites.* Which is enough to show that you are persuaded they abstained from the use of these words *for some reason.* Yet that *this* could not be the reason, you may be sufficiently instructed in the word *Baptism*, this being as fully *Jewish*, as was either the word *Priest, Altar*, or *Temple;* and yet used of the Apostle without danger of innovation of the *Jewish* manner of *Baptisms.* Yea, and if the

Again.—"Si non certo, saltem verisimiliter concluditur, ante Basilii tempora Liturgias Græcas literis non fuisse consignatas." (Ibid, p. ix. See also pp. xxx.—xxxviii.)

"Preces ipsæ Liturgicæ quum plerumque sub initium saltem nascentis Ecclesiæ non tam conceptis verbis, quam divino adflante numine ab Apostolis funderentur, non eadem semper temporis mensura contineri poterant." (Zaccharia: "Bibliotheca Ritualis," vol. i., dissertatio i., cap. ii., p. xx.; Rome, 1776. See below pp. 560, 561.)

Apostles had thought the *Altar, Priest, Sacrifice*, to be *essential parts* of Christian religion, they *neither would nor* OUGHT *to have concealed* the words and names, lest thereby they might have seemed to have abhorred the *proper characters* of our Christian profession." (Morton on Eucharist, bk. vi., ch. 5, sect. 15, pp. 461, 462; Edit. 1635. See Hickes's Treatises, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. ii., p. 245, sqq.)

Note X, p. 455.

Dr. Brett says of the Oblation, "That it is OMITTED in the Communion Office of the Church of England, is EVIDENT to all that are acquainted with that liturgy; and that it was NOT *casually*, but WILFULLY, left out there, is NO LESS EVIDENT." And again he says, "The words, 'to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' . . . . as they are now placed in the post-communion *can by no means be applied to the material elements; for it is absurd to pretend that we may offer to God that which is not, or present to him that which we have eaten and consumed.* . . . . . This omission and transposition could not be made otherwise than with design." (See Goode's Rule of Faith, vol. ii., p. 362.)

Dr. Blakeney says of the first thanksgiving after Communion, "This is the only prayer which refers to sacrifice, but this cannot refer to the elements, and, moreover, IT NEED NOT BE USED AT ALL, the minister having his choice of this or the next, which, in itself proves that it cannot refer to the sacrifice of the elements, for, in that case it would be *essential* to the service! It is a fact which can not be got over, that the Church of England expunged the words which contained an offering of the body of Christ. There are no such words in our service." (Blakeney on Common Prayer, p. 422.)

"This cannot be properly an oblation or outward and unbloody sacrifice, because this prayer is put after the Communion, to be a thanksgiving and spiritual sacrifice of praise to God for the blessings of the Communion received."

'The Church of England in her reformed Liturgy (we offer

ourselves, souls and bodies, etc.) may truly and boldly say that in this, she hath far exceeded their Canon of their Mass, in which there is not one syllable that mentions the sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, which is the only thing that God calls and looks for at our hands, and in Christ our Head is most pleasing; nay, more, only pleasing to him, and in our power to offer properly. We deny not the daily sacrifice of the Church, which is the Church itself. We take not upon us to sacrifice the natural body of Christ, otherwise than by commemoration, which, once offered by Himself, purchased eternal redemption all sufficient; and therefore not to be offered again and often. But we offer Christ's mystical body—the Church—ourselves, souls and bodies, which is the daily sacrifice of Christ's body (mystical), and warranted by Scripture and Fathers, etc.' Bishop Buckeridge, in Sermon on Heb. xiii. 16, at the funeral of Bishop Andrewes," (MSS. notes in interleaved Prayer Book in British Museum. Among the Harleian MSS., No. 7311.)

"We offer up ourselves, we offer up our prayers, and praises, and ourselves; and all these we offer up in the virtue and consideration of Christ's sacrifice, represented before us by way of remembrance and commemoration; nor can it be proved that the ancients did more than this. This whole service was their Christian sacrifice, and this is ours. But the Romanists have invented a new sacrifice, which Christ never instituted, which the Apostles never dreamt of, which the primitive Christians would have abhorred, and which we, if we will be followers of them, ought never to join in." (Archbishop Sharp's Works; Edit., Oxford, 1829, vol. v., pp. 196, 197.)

Note Y, p. 455.

The extract is from Mr. Joseph Bardsley's Lecture in "Truths for the Times," (Hunt, pp. 92—94). The following is from the Charge of the Bishop of St. David's, 1866, pp. 94—96:—

"The difference is marked by their several names and descriptions. The one is an Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion; the other for the celebration of a sacrifice. The

difference indicated by the titles is equally conspicuous in the contents of the two liturgies. In the Anglican, the idea which is most exclusively predominant is that of Communion. There is indeed an offertory, and an oblation of common things for sacred and charitable uses. There is mention of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving which appears to include the whole rite; and the communicants 'offer and present themselves, their souls and bodies, as a living sacrifice.' But of any other kind of sacrifice, and particularly of any sacrificial oblation of the consecrated elements, there is not a word. The consecration is immediately followed by the Communion, which is the great business of the whole. On the other hand, the Council of Trent pronounces an anathema on those who say that there is not offered to God in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice, or that the offering consists only in Christ's being given to us for manducation; or that the sacrifice of the Mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice performed on the cross, and not propitiatory. A more direct conflict of views, if they are supposed to relate to the same subject, or to two subjects not essentially different from one another, it would be difficult to conceive; for that which the Council emphatically denies to be the sacrifice of the Mass, is the only thing to which our Church gives the name of *her* sacrifice. That which the Council declares to be the true and proper sacrifice of the Mass, is an offering as to which our Church is absolutely silent.

It might have seemed to anyone who read our Communion Office, a strange and hopeless understanding to bring it into harmony with the Mass; and I think that the Ritualists who have made the attempt, have failed to produce anything more than a deceptive show of resemblance, but of the harmony between their own views and those of the Church of Rome in this respect, they have given the most unequivocal signs. The rite which they celebrate they describe as the Sacrifice of the Altar or the Mass. The splendour with which they invest it is certainly more appropriate to the oblation of a sacrifice than to the reception and participation of a gift. And, feeling that this would still be insufficient for the purpose, they interpolate our Office with large extracts from the Canon of the Mass, in which the sacrifice is explicitly announced, and which the 'celebrant' is directed to use as private prayers. I must own that

there is something in this adulteration,—as I think I may not improperly term it,—of the Prayer Book out of the Missal, which to my sense has an unpleasant savour of artifice* and disingenuousness. It is a proceeding of which I think both Churches have reason to complain: the one, that her mind is not only disregarded, but misrepresented; the other, that her treasures are rifled to set off her adversary with a false semblance of likeness to herself."

Note Z, p. 455.

"The sacrifice which Christ offered up on the cross for the sins of the world we believe with all our hearts, and reverence with all our might: accounting the same to be PERFECT without *wanting*, ETERNAL without *renewing*, and this is *our* SOVEREIGN *sacrifice*. The Lord's table, which himself ordered to be the memorial of His death and passion, we keep and continue in that manner and form that He first prescribed, and this *may be called*, and *is* a sacrifice, both in respect of the thanks there given to God for the redemption of man, and the bloodshedding of our Saviour *expressed* and *resembled* in that mystery. More than this no Catholic father ever taught, and less than this our Churches do not receive." (Bishop Bilson's True Difference, p. 5. Edit. 1585. See also p. 699.)

"Epistola igitur ad Heb. à Sacrificio Christi Iterationem, utpote imperfectionis argumentum, plane removet. *Et cum sciamus Christum suscitatum a mortuis non amplius mori*, Rom. vi. 9, hinc abundè constat Sacrificium ejus repeti non posse, atque adeo non posse dari in Ecclesiâ Sacrificium, quod cum Sacrificio in cruce oblato *specie idem sit, vel tale essentialiter* quale illud fuit, vel de quo et Sacrificio Crucis univocè Sacrificium prædicetur." (From Notes supposed to be from the Collections of Bishop Overall in Nicholls's Additional

* These, no doubt, are strong expressions. Whether or not such language is justified by the circumstances, I prefer to leave for others to determine. A friend, whose judgment I value, writes—"So it would certainly be regarded in the business transactions of men of the world: and how can we that are spiritual assume such an appearance of evil to be guiltless?"

Notes, p. 46, really Bishop Cosin's from Callixtus. See Cosin's Works, Ang.-Cath. Libr., vol. v., p. 334.)

"It [the Eucharistic sacrifice] was then [in the ancient Church] believed to be an ἀνάμνησις, or *commemoration*, by the symbols of bread and wine, of the body and blood of Christ, once offered up to God on the cross for our redemption; it could not therefore be then thought an offering up again to God of *the very body and blood of Christ*, SUBSTANTIALLY PRESENT under the appearance of bread and wine; for these two notions are inconsistent, and cannot stand together. The ancient doctors, yea and Liturgies of the Church, affirm the Eucharist to be *incruentum sacrificium*, 'a sacrifice without blood;' which it cannot be said to be, if the very blood of Christ were therein present and offered up to God. In the Clementine Liturgy, the bread and wine in the Eucharist are said to be *antitypa*, 'correspondent types,' figures, and images of the precious body and blood of Christ. And divers others of the Fathers speak in the same plain language." (Bishop Bull, "Corruptions of the Church of Rome," sect. 3, vol. ii., pp. 254-5. Edit. Oxford, 1846.)

"In the Eucharist then, Christ is offered, NOT HYPOSTATICALLY, as the Trent Fathers have determined, (for so He was but once offered) but COMMEMORATIVELY ONLY: and this commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering, or putting OURSELVES in mind of Him." (Ibid, p. 252.)

"No one is so blind as not to see the difference between a *proper offering*, which was once performed by His death on the cross, and between an *improper offering*, which is now made either in heaven, by that His appearance on our behalf, or here on earth by Prayers and Representation, or Obtestation or Commemoration, *there being* ONLY *the same* COMMON NAME for these, but a VERY WIDE DIFFERENCE *in the things themselves*. . . . There is no form or reason of the Oblation given, which can be *univocally* predicated of THAT; for upon the cross the Oblation was made by a true Destruction and Death of the live-thing, *without which no Sacrifice* PROPERLY *so called can be*. But in our Eucharist, there is a Sacrifice made by Prayers, a commemoration, and a Representation, which is NOT PROPERLY a Sacrifice. But nothing hinders, but that the Eucharist may be accounted and called the *Commemorative* Sacrifice of the PROPER SACRIFICE of the Death of Christ; which our Lord Himself hath taught us, when He

said, *This do in remembrance of Me.*" (From Notes collected by Bishop Cosin, communicated by Dr. Pickering in Nicholl's Additional Notes to Common Prayer, pp. 50, 51. See correspondence of Marriott and Carter—Rivingtons, Part ii., p. 99.)

Bishop Bilson says:—"Indeed this hath been not the least of Satan's sleights in conveying your religion from step to step, and point by point, to *keep the speech, and change the sense* of the learned and ancient Fathers." (Bishop Bilson's True Difference, Edit. 1585, p. 688, see especially p. 702.)

"You shall find how the ancient Fathers doubted not to say that *Christ suffereth, is slain, slayeth Himself, suffereth often in this Sacrament:* and that *His Passion and Bloody Sacrifice is offered herein.* . . . What think you of such sayings? Can Christ be said to be *Dead* in this Sacrament? *Never any Catholic said so* (saith your Jesuit *Ribera.*) What then could be the meaning of such words? If you should be ignorant, your Cardinal *Alan* would teach you, and he would have you *observe* what he saith: *Christ is said by the Fathers to suffer* (saith he) *and to die in this Sacrament* ONLY SO FAR as His Death and Passion is COMMEMORATED *and* REPRESENTED *herein:* And so speaketh your Roman *Gloss.* What now hindereth but that whensoever we hear the same Fathers affirming that the same *Body* and *Blood* of Christ are *sacrificed* in the Eucharist, we understand them in the same impropriety of speech, that they meant only *Representatively?* . . . The Fathers, as they say that *Christ is Dead, and suffereth* (as you now object) in *this Sacrament* IN A MYSTERY: so have they also said of His Body, in respect of the Eucharist, *It is Sacrificed in an Image, in a Sacrament, in Mystery;* according to that their general qualification, saying *It is the same sacrifice which Christ offered*, or *rather a* REMEMBRANCE THEREOF." (Morton on Eucharist, Book vi., chap. 5, Sect. xi., pp. 455, 456, 457. Edit. 1635.)

"*As when the day of Christ's Passion* (saith he [St. Augustine]) *being to-morrow, or the day of His Resurrection about to be the next day but one; we use to say of the former, To-morrow is Christ's Passion; and of the other, When it cometh, it is Christ's Resurrection, yet will none be so absurd as to say, we lie in so saying, because we speak it* BY WAY OF SIMILITUDE: *even so when we say,* THIS IS SACRIFICED, etc. So St. Augustine. Who now seeth not, that as the

Burial of Christ is not the subject matter of *Baptism*, but only the *Representative object* thereof; and as *Good Friday*, and *Easter Day*, are not properly the days of Christ His *Passion* or *Resurrection*, but *Anniversary*, and *Representative*, or *Commemorative* Resemblances of them: so this *sacrifice* is a SIMILITUDE of the Sacrifice of Christ on the *Cross*, and not materially the same." (Morton on Eucharist: Book vi., chap. 5, sect. 4, p. 442. Edit. 1635.)

"An unbloody sacrifice . . . . can be no other than figurative and commemorative; is it really propitiatory? *without shedding of blood is no remission*, (Heb. ix. 22.) If, therefore, sins be remitted by this sacrifice, it must be in relation to that blood, which was shed in the true personal sacrifice upon the cross: and what relation can be betwixt this and that, but of representation and remembrance? in which their moderate Cassander fully resteth." (Bishop Hall's Works: vol. ix., p. 259. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

"In the Christian Church there is only one proper sacrifice which our Lord offered upon the Cross; and, consequently, Christians cannot partake of any sacrifice in a literal and strict sense, without allowing transubstantiation: lest, therefore, they should want the same pledge to assure them of the Divine favour which the Jews enjoyed, our Lord appointed the Elements of bread and wine to signify His body and blood offered in sacrifice; whence they are expressly called His body and blood, it being common for representatives to bear the name of those things or persons which they represent." (Archbishop Potter on Church Government, p. 184. Edit. Crosthwaite, 1845.)

Note A A, p. 458.

"The effect of this alteration, as regarded impanation, was clearly pointed out by Dr. Scott, Bishop of Chester, in 1559, in a speech delivered by him 'in the Parliament house against the bill of the Liturgy,' or for Uniformity of Common Prayer. 'The Doctors of the Church,' he said, 'affirm that an intention to do that which Christ did, *i.e.* to consecrate His body and blood, is a circumstance of

absolute necessity. For this purpose the Church hath appointed certain prayers in the canon of the mass to be said before the consecration; the words are these, 'Ut fiat nobis Corpus et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi,' *i.e.* that the elements may be made unto us the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. There the intention of the Church and of the priest officiating is plainly declared; but in this new book there is neither any such intention declared nor any petition put up to God for that purpose. The contrary does rather appear by these words in their office, 'that we receiving this thy creatures of bread and wine may, etc., which words declare they intend nothing of consecration. And if so let them value themselves as they please upon their communion, it is to no manner of purpose, in regard the body of Christ is not there, which, as I have already observed, is the thing which should be communicated.'" (Principles at Stake, pp. 153-4.)

The change had been urged by Bucer. "In the Prayer of Consecration he [Bucer] would have these words of blessing and sanctifying the bread and wine, that they might be made to us the body and blood of Christ, changed into these of blessing and sanctifying us, that with true Faith we might receive the body and blood of Christ in these holy Mysteries, as heavenly Food. To which purpose they were afterwards altered, because the former Words (as he said) gave occasion, to confirm Men in Popish Conceit of Transubstantiation; and because we had no Precept nor Example from the Apostles to make any such Prayer for the blessing of the bread, etc." (Bishop Cosin in Nicholls's additional Notes to Common Prayer, p. 53. See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 618. See also Bucer's Scripta Anglicana.)

Geste, giving the reasons to Cecil, why the Committee of Divines (reviewing the Prayer Book under Elizabeth) had not adopted the Consecration Prayer of the *first* Book of Edward, says "This prayer is to be disliked for two causes,—The first, because it is taken to be so needful for the conservation that the conservation is not thought to be without it. Which is not true. . . . Gregory writeth to the bishop of Syracuse that the Apostles used only the Lord's prayer at the Communion, and none other. . . . Justine, in showing how the Communion was celebrated in his time, maketh no mention of invocation; no more doth Irenee. The second cause, why the foresaid prayer is to be refused is, for that it prayeth that the bread

and wine may be Christ's body and blood, which maketh for the Popish transubstantiation, which is a doctrine that hath caused much idolatry. And though the doctors so speak, yet we must speak otherwise, because we take them otherwise than they meant, or would be taken. For, when their *meaning* is *corrupted*, then their *words* must be *expounded*." (In Dugdale's Life, pp. 147-8.)

It has been argued that the passage in Gregory referred to by Geste is corrupt. (See Maskell's "Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England," Pref., p. xxii.) The statement, however, is not disputed by Bellarmine.* (De Missâ, Lib. i., cap. xxvii., De Controvers: vol. iii., pp. 1036, 1038. Ingolstadt, 1601.)

Speaking of the language of the Eastern Liturgies invoking the Holy Spirit that "He sanctify and make this bread the holy body of thy Christ," etc., Dean Goode remarks, "Terms indicative of some sort of Change were freely used by the Fathers of that period. But the question recurs, What was their *meaning* in the use of these words? What *sort of change* was contemplated by them? And first I must observe, that *no language* could be more thoroughly opposed to the doctrine of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison than that of these Liturgies. For it clearly contemplates, as *the effect* of the descent of the Holy Spirit, a change of some kind or other passing upon the bread and wine. Now, according to Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison, *the great effect* of the consecration is the *junction* of

* Bellarmine's words are, "Etsi Apostoli initio solam orationem Dominicam addidisse dicantur, tamen postea iidem ordinaverunt ritum celebrandi, et multa alia addiderunt."

Cassander speaking of subsequent additions in the Roman Service says (quoting from Rupertus) "Non quidem sanctius hinc est, quam erat prius, quando ad sola verba Domini, solamque Dominicam orationem consecrabatur." (Works, p. 37. Edit. Paris, 1616. See also p. 38, where further testimony is adduced as to the original simplicity of the Service.)

Durandus writes, "Missam instituit Dominus Jesus . . . dicens *Hoc est corpus meum* . . subjungens: *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. Apostoli autem hanc Missam adauxerunt, dicentes in Missa non solum verba præmissa, verum etiam dominicam orationem superaddentes. Unde beatus Petrus sic Missam primus dicitur Celebrasse in partibus orientalibus." (Durandus, Rationale Div. Offic: Lib. iv., cap. 1, p. 140. Naples, 1859. See, however, on the other side Zaccharia "Bibliotheca Ritualis," vol. i., Dissertatio i., p. xvi. Rome, 1776.)

"Sequitur oblatio panis et calicis vino et aqua misti, *quam ut* SIMPLICISSIMAM *initio fuisse* verisimile omnino est, ita decenter et cum reverentia factam fuisse, non est dubitandum." (Renaudot: Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio. Tom. i., Dissertatio, p. vii. Frankfort-on-Maine, 1847. See also Bullinger "De Origino Erroris." Fo. 204, a Zurich, 1539.)

our Lord's body and blood *with* the bread and wine. And it is manifest, that if their doctrine had been the doctrine of the Church at the time that these Liturgies were put forth, the prayer would have been, that the Holy Spirit would cause the body and blood of Christ to be *united to* the bread and wine, and not that the bread and wine should be made or changed into that body and blood. And Dr. Pusey, when speaking of the language of the Liturgies, admits, that 'the Fathers not only say, that the bread *becomes* the body of Christ, but that it *is* the body of Christ.' And he justly reminds the Romanists, that 'this is inconsistent with conversion, as they believe it, or transubstantiation.' But what is *his own* explanation? I give it in his own words, 'The proposition, *This bread is my body*, could have no other meaning than that it was in some way, Both. *This, which is in its natural substance, bread, is sacramentally my body, through the presence of my body under its form.*' But is this one whit more reasonable than the Roman Catholic interpretation? Let us try it in another case,—The proposition 'This picture is the Duke of Wellington,' could have no other meaning than that it was in some way, *both*. 'This, which is in its natural substance a picture, is in another way the Duke of Wellington, *through the presence of the Duke of Wellington under its form.*' Is this sound reasoning? . . . . Dr. Pusey has assumed the very thing he had to prove, when he identifies a *sacramental* presence with the presence of the real body under the form of the bread. . . . Bellarmine candidly admits, that it is only *figuratively* that bread can *be* the body of Christ. . . . . The question remains, What is the change here referred to? . . . There are three modes of answering this question. The *first* is that of the Romanists. . . . The *second* is that advocated by, among others, Johnson. . . . The *third* is, that the bread and wine are changed in *character, use, and effect*, so as to be effectual in the case of all faithful communicants, through the Divine blessing, for making their recipients partakers of the body and blood of Christ, by bringing them into communion with them, and thus become *sacramentally*, and in *effect* the body and blood of Christ." (On Eucharist, i., pp. 443—445.) This is clearly the sense in which the words of the consecration Prayer of Edward's *first* Book were understood by Cranmer, and in which he took care to have them "*explained*" in the *Second* Book. See note above, p. 518.

Note BB, p. 459.

"It is well known that both Bishop Cosin and his friend Mr. (afterwards Archbishop) Sancroft used their best endeavours, at the time of the last revision in 1662, to conform the Communion Service more closely to that of 1549, and especially to restore the Prayer of Oblation to its ancient place immediately after the consecration, as 'more consonant both to former precedents and the nature of the holy action.'" (Medd's Introduction to Walton's "First Book of Edward VI.," p. xxi. See Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 143, 421, 433; Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 389—392, 376—378; and especially 391, 392, with note.)

Appended to the additional notes in Nicholls's Book of Common Prayer, is a paper of notes made by Bishop Cosin previous to or at the time of the last Review, of matters which he considered desirable to be altered in the Prayer Book, and of which Dr. Nicholls remarks, that "*most things*" were altered accordingly.

It may indeed be observed that these suggestions of Bishop Cosin DO appear to have been ALMOST ALL embodied in the changes of 1662. But what is MOST *observable*, is that the striking exceptions are just those matters which might have seemed to tend to afford a handle for undoing the CLEARING *work* of our Reformers on the first Book of Edward. While of other alterations it may be said that AS A WHOLE they have been ACCEPTED: of these (though they are but very few) it must be said that AS A WHOLE they have been REJECTED.

This is so clear and striking, that, if we knew nothing else of the history of the last Review, it would seem sufficiently to attest the fact, that (notwithstanding the power of other influences at work) that Review was governed by a deliberate determination to make no room for the bringing in again of those Eucharistic doctrines which the Reformation had cleared away.

There was no disposition to reject the Bishop's recommendations. But there was a sense of apprehension, or a vigilance against danger, such as the Bishop apparently did not share; and with this evidently a resolution to allow no changes which would seem to make the voice of the Church of England less distinct in its condemnation of the Corporal Presence, and the sacrifice of the Mass.

So with the copy of the Edition of 1634, containing MSS. corrections

in the handwriting of Sancroft—the corrections *as a whole* were "approved by the Convocation, and incorporated in the future Liturgy." But there were exceptions, and these exceptions are just those "which would seem to belong to the Laudian school of theology."

These, *as a whole*,* were rejected. (See Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 389—392.)

See also Blakeney's "Common Prayer," pp. 143—147, and J. H. Blunt's "Common Prayer," p. 186, note 1, and Historical Introduction, p. xli.

"Cosin proposed a re-arrangement and modification of the Prayers of Address, of the Consecration, Oblation, and the Lord's Prayer, in the Communion Office; at the bottom of the page in the Durham book is written in Sancroft's hand [who probably acted as Secretary to the committee of Bishops] My Lords the bishops at Ely House [where the Committee held their meetings] *ordered* ALL *in the* OLD *method*, thus, etc." (Editor's Preface to vol. v. of Cosin's Works, Anglo-Catholic Library, p. xxii. See note in the same vol., p. 518. See also Bulley's Variations, p. 142, note, and pp. 190, 191, 200.)

It is not unimportant to observe that the last Revision was *not* the work of the Savoy *Commission*, *but* of the *Convocation* and Parliament.† Dr. Blakeney says, "Notwithstanding the *utter failure* of the Savoy Commission, some authors have fallen into the mistake that our Prayer Book was revised at the Savoy," (p. 145, note). "The Parliament evinced a determination rather to fall back upon the book of 1604, or even the 2nd of Edward, than accept that of Laud. compiled in 1634," (p. 143). "The great body of the clergy surviving the Commonwealth had no sympathy with Laudianism. This, in some degree, may account for the fact that, while the proposals of Sancroft were rejected, many of the Puritan suggestions to which the Episcopal Commissioners would not listen, were carried into effect," (p. 145). See Cardwell's Conferences, chap. viii., and Preface to

* This does not mean without exception. But the few exceptions will be allowed, think, to be comparatively immaterial, and free from any special doctrinal significance

† Not that the House of Commons took any action on the matter of the changes introduced beyond asserting their power to reconsider them. An account of their proceedings will be found in Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 374—378. See also p. 373.

Nicholls's Common Prayer, p. x., and Burnet's History of his own time, pp. 124-5. Edit. Bohn.

Something like a similar attempt (it appears) had been made in the reign of Elizabeth and with the same result. At least Edward's Second Book was not restored (as a whole) without serious opposition. (See Nicholls's Preface to Common Prayer, p. vi.)

"Though Cecil, and some other of the courtiers, were for having King Edward's First Book established, or at least, to have some Particulars in it again received, as Prayers for the Dead, the Petition for the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Elements, in the Prayer for the Consecration of the Eucharist, and the delivering of the Bread into the mouth of the Communicant: yet the most learned of our Divines were against both these Proposals, and pitched on the second Liturgy to be established, with some few Alterations and Corrections." (Downes's Appendix appended to Sparrow's Rationale, 1722, p. 180.)

With respect to Cecil, Downes's Statement may be considered perhaps, to go somewhat too far. (See Collier's Eccl. History, vol. vi., p. 249, and Cardwell's Conferences, p. 21.) Evidence of the opposition may be seen in Strype's Annals, vol. i., chap. 4, pp. 82, 83.

Dr. Blakeney says, "There was a disposition on the part of the Queen to adopt the first rather than the second book, and this accounts at once both for the Primer of 1559, and the Orarium of 1560. The Bishops overruled the Royal tendencies in reference to images and altars, and we see the triumph of their principles in the fact that the later books of devotion of Elizabeth were completely Protestant." (On Common Prayer, p. 187.)

Note C C, p. 459.

It must not, however, be forgotten that the changes (such as they are) which have been made, have been, by no means, all in one direction. Some have been made in concession to the views of the Puritans, and these, perhaps (in the view of some) not the least important. It may be said of the changes made in the Prayer Book

in Elizabeth's reign, that they were of a reactionary character (in the sense given in the text): not that they did, in any wise, alter the doctrine of our Church, but that their tendency was to make some points of decided Protestant doctrine less marked and prominent than before.

On the other hand, the changes made after the Hampton Court Conference (such as they were) are to be regarded as concessions to the Puritan party.

At the last review, it must be allowed that the influence of reactionary tendencies was kept in check, and, in the more important matters, completely defeated.

Canon Robertson writes: "A comparison with Sparrow's 'Rationale,' will show that Cosin's authority in the revision was controlled in many points by that of Sparrow, who seems, from coincidences, not only of opinion but of language, to have also had much influence on the answer of the Episcopal party to the objections of the Non-conformists at the Savoy Conference." ("How shall we Conform," p. 26, Note, Edit. 1869.)

As the result of the Review, we may be said to have a certain number of changes of no great importance or doctrinal significance, to a very few of which may be attributed somewhat of a reactionary character. But against these must be set the re-introduction of the Black Rubrick, which was the undoing of the chief work of the reactionary influence in Elizabeth's reign, as well as other less important concessions to the desires of the Puritans.

Walton (whose view, however, may be regarded as not altogether unprejudiced,) says, in his Life of Bp. Sanderson (p. 42 in Sanderson's Sermons, Edit. 1686), "Though this debate at the Savoy was ended without any great satisfaction to either party, yet both parties knew the desires, and understood the abilities of the other much better than before it; and the late distressed clergy, that were now restored to their former rights and power, were so charitable, as at their next meeting in Convocation to contrive to give the dissenting party satisfaction by alteration, explanation, and addition to some part, both of the *Rubrick and Common Prayer*, as also by adding some new necessary Collects, with a particular Collect of Thanksgiving."

Dr. Blakeney has pointed out that several of the changes "gene-

rally supposed to be of a retrogressive character," cannot fairly be set down in that class, and were some of them even made at the recommendation or suggestion of the Puritans. (See Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 153—156.)

Note D D, p. 460.

"There seems to have been no objection to this invocation (so customary* in the ancient liturgies) on any doctrinal ground, except for its connection with the clause in the latter part of the sentence, implying the real presence in the consecrated elements. "That they may be unto us," etc., and that connexion not only caused its omission in 1552, but probably also prevented its restoration at the last review." (Principles at Stake, p. 273.)

"I may take notice . . . . . of the wisdom of our first Reformers, who, while they thought of inserting any prayer at all for the *illapse* of the *Spirit*, resolved to do it equally and indifferently in *both* the *Offices*, as well in the office of Baptism as in the office of the Communion; for there is, undoubtedly, as much reason and as great authority for it with respect to the former, as there is with respect to the latter.

* "Invocatur autem [Spiritus Sanctus] super *omnia* quæ ad sacrum usum destinantur, quâ invocatione *significatur consecratio* rei ipsi inhærens, etiam absque usu sacro, materiæque dignitatem tribuens. Ita in orationibus quarum particulas retulimus ad vasa sacra benedicenda, invocatur Deus, ut ea consecret, eo fine ut in illis conficiantur Sacramenta. Inde vero eadem vasa sancta habentur, nec profanis manibus absque crimine tractari possunt. Invocatur quoque ut mittat Spiritum sanctum *super aquas baptismales*, ut in illis baptisati accipiant regenerationem, omniumque peccatorum remissionem: super *oleum* et *chrisma*, ut gratiam baptisatis novam conferant: super *ordinandos*, ut accipiant sanctimoniam, et potestatem ad sacra ministeria sancte exercenda: super *oleum infirmorum*, ut ejus unctio prosit infirmis, ad salutem animæ et corporis." (Renaudot Liturg: Orient.. Tom. i., p. 179. Edit. Frankfort, 1847.)

See Waterland's Works, vol. iv., p. 692, sqq.; who says "All circumstances show, that the true and ancient intent of that part of the service was not to implore any *physical* change in the Elements, no, nor so much as a physical *connexion* of the Spirit with the *Elements*, but a *moral* change only in the *Elements*, as to *relations* and uses, and a gracious presence of the Holy Spirit upon the *communicants*." (Page 692.)

Indeed, they were both thrown out afterwards, upon *prudential* considerations, and at the instance, chiefly, of two learned and judicious foreigners, whom Archbishop Cranmer called in to assist at the review of our Liturgy in 1551." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 695.)

"The prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit is by no means express in either of the ancient English uses, or in the Roman." (Maskell's Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, Pref. p. l.)

"There is no trace of any prayer for the Holy Ghost to bless and consecrate the elements in the ancient liturgies of Milan, Italy, and Rome." (Palmer's Origines Liturgicæ, vol. ii., p. 137.)

"Oral tradition being admitted to be the only means of conveyance used for three centuries, the forms that prevailed in the Church at the period when the Liturgy was first committed to writing, cannot be held to be sufficient proofs of the nature of the service as it existed three centuries before. More particularly is this the case with respect to any part which is not *common to* ALL the most ancient liturgies we have remaining. And in the very part which is chiefly referred to . . . . there is a *discrepancy* between them. For no invocation of the Holy Spirit occurs in the most ancient forms of the Roman Liturgy."* (Goode on Eucharist i., pp. 439, 440. See also Courayer on English Orders. Oxford Edit. p. 175.)

"Although . . . . some few have contended that the Apostles left behind them written liturgies, yet so great is the majority against

* "For the three first centuries, and part of the fourth, nothing at all was said, as far as appears, of any descent of the *third Person* upon the Elements." (Waterland's Works, vol. v., p. 189. See also vol. iv., pp. 695, 696.)

Renaudot says—"Observandum denique Syros in eâ [Invocationis formâ] *veterem simplicitatem* magis retinuisse quam Græcos, qui formulas aliquot interponunt, ut in Liturgiâ Basilii Sacerdos secreto dicit: *Domine qui Spiritum sanctum hora tertia Apostolis misisti, illum, o bone, ne auferas a me. Cor mundam crea in me, Deus, et Spiritum rectum invoca in visceribas meis.* Tum Diaconus caput inclinans, designat orario sanctum panem et dicit secreto: *Benedic, Domines sanctum panem.*" (Renaudot, Liturg: Orient: Tom. ii., p. 94. Edit. Frankfort, 1847.)

"I cannot think this Prayer [of Invocation] necessary, which is nowhere mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, and has no manner of foundation in the word of God. . . . I do not believe, but that some of the Ante-Nicene Fathers would have expressly mentioned it, if it had been the Established Doctrine of the Church in those Ages, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper were made the body and blood of Christ, by the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon them." (*The Doctrine of the Eucharist stated: and the Harmony between the Primitive Church and the Reformed Church of England manifested, by which the Conduct of our new Essentialists is censured; by a Presbyter of the Church of England*, p. 43. London, 1720, p. 43.)

them, that we may say it is agreed upon that they did not. . . . . It appears also to be not less agreed upon that for many years after, perhaps for the first two centuries, liturgies were not committed to writing. Renaudot is clearly of this opinion: he says that it is beyond all controversy, and cites S. Basil, *de Spiritu Sancto*, to prove that before his time no liturgy was written." (Maskell's Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, Pref. pp. xxiv., xxv. See Courayer on English Orders. Oxford Edit. p. 173. See above, p. 543, 544. Note.)

Note E E, p. 465.

Let the reader be asked to compare this statement with the following directions contained in a Ritualistic "Manual of Devotions."

"*Rubric.* Now kneel upright with your hands clasped upon your heart; follow the Priest in silent awe; for Jesus thy God is very nigh thee. He is *about to* DESCEND *upon the* ALTAR surrounded by the fire of the Holy Ghost and attended by His angels.

At the consecration and ELEVATION. Prostrate yourself in the dust and say,—Hail! Body of my God. Hail! Body of my Redeemer, I ADORE, I ADORE, I ADORE Thee."

The "Little Prayer Book" recommends this prayer—"BREAD *made Flesh* by the Omnipotence of the Word, have mercy upon us!" (See Principles at Stake, pp. 166—168.)

Compare also the following from "The People's Hymnal," (No. 179.)

"Jesu, my Lord, my God, my all!
How can I love Thee as I ought?
And how revere this wondrous Gift,
So far surpassing hope or thought?
Sweet SACRAMENT, *we* THEE *adore!*
O make us *love* THEE more and more!

* * * *

"O see! within a *creature's* HAND
The VAST CREATOR deigns to be,
Reposing, infant-like, as though
On Joseph's arm, or Mary's knee.
Sweet SACRAMENT, *we* THEE *adore!*
O make us *love* THEE more and more!

* * * *

"Sound, sound His praises higher still,
And come, ye angels, to our aid;
'TIS GOD! 'TIS GOD! THE VERY GOD!
Whose power both men and angels made.
Sweet SACRAMENT, we THEE *adore!*
O make us *love* THEE more and more!"

Dr. Heurtley well observes (Remarks on Declaration, p. 12,) "When the influence of poetry and music combined is considered, it is not difficult to foresee, that if this Hymnal should be brought into general use, and become in reality, what its title vaunts it to be, 'The People's Hymnal,' *the work of our Reformers* will be virtually *undone*. It *signifies* LITTLE to restrain RITUAL *observances*, if the *evil leaven*, which those observances are believed to cover, is permitted to be introduced more effectually in another way."

Bishop Morton writes:—"You press the point of the *Invocation of the Sacrament* more urgently and vehemently than any other: and we indeed believe that the ancient Fathers (if they had held, according to the now Roman Church, a *corporal presence of Christ*) would never have celebrated any Mass, without an express *Invocation* of the Sacrament, as in your now-Roman mass, we find it done. . . . . Yet know (now) that your own learned *Pamelius* hath published two large Tomes of all the *Masses in the Latin Church*, from Pope *Clemens* down to Pope *Gregory* (containing the compass of six hundred years) we say, Latin Missals above forty in number; in all which, upon our once reading, we presume to say that there is not one such tenour of *Invocation* at all." (Morton on Eucharist. Book vii., chap. 4, sect. 1, p. 525. Edit. 1635.)

And so Bishop Bilson:—"That these and all other parts of divine

honour are due to Christ, no Christian may doubt; but that the same may be applied to the host, this is your blasphemy, *no father ever taught it.* . . . He [Christ] is more truly, really and naturally in those men that be His members than He is in the elements that be used at His table. . . . Men are the members of Christ, bread is not; Christ abideth in them, and they in Him, in the bread He doeth not: He will raise them in the last day, the bread He will not; they shall reign with Him for ever, the bread shall not. . . . I send you to Chrysostom, Cyril and Hilary, who will teach you . . . . that Christ is *in us* really, naturally, corporally, carnally, substantially, which of the Sacrament you shall never be able to prove. For the Sacrament is no part of His mystical body, as we are, and therefore we are knit unto Him even by the truth of His and our nature, flesh, and substance, as members of the same body to their head; the Sacrament is not, but only annexed as a sign to the heavenly grace and virtue of Christ mightily present, and truly entering the soul of every man that is fitly prepared with faith and repentance to receive and lodge so worthy a guest." (Bishop Bilson's True Differences, etc. Edit. 1585, pp. 719, 720.)

Archbishop Bramhall says—"We deny not a venerable respect unto the consecrate Elements, not only as love-tokens sent us by our best Friend, but as the instruments ordained by our Saviour to convey to us the merits of His Passion; but [and?] for the Person of Christ, God forbid that we should deny Him Divine worship at any time, and especially in the use of this Holy Sacrament; we believe with St. Austin, that 'no man eats of that Flesh, but first he adores:' —but that which offends us is this, that you teach and require all men to adore the very Sacrament with Divine honour. To this end you hold it out to the people. To this end *Corpus Christi* day was instituted about 300 years since. Yet we know that even upon your own grounds you cannot without a particular revelation, have an infallible assurance that any Host is consecrated; and consequently you have no assurance that you do not commit material idolatry. But that which weighs most with us is this, that we dare not give Divine worship to any creature, no, not to the very humanity of Christ in the abstract (much less to the Host), but to the *whole* Person of Christ, God and Man, by reason of the hypostatical union between the child of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the Eternal Son,

'Who is God over all Blessed for ever.' *Shew us such an union betwixt the Deity and the Elements*, or accidents, and you say something. But you pretend no such things. The highest that you dare go is this: 'as they that adored Christ when He was upon earth, did after a kind of manner adore His garments.' Is this all? That is 'after a kind of manner' indeed. We have enough. There is no more adoration due to the Sacrament, than to the garments which Christ did wear upon earth. Exact no more." (Bramhall's Works, Oxford Edit., vol. i., pp. 20, 21.)

"The Grecians know no feast of *Corpus Christi*, nor carry the Sacrament up and down, nor elevate it to be adored." (Ibid, vol. ii., p. 634.)

See also Crakanthorp "Defensio Eccles: Anglic." Edit. Oxford., pp. 538, 539; and Morton's Catholic Appeal, p. 120; and Dr. Andrew Willet's Synopsis Papismi, vol. v., pp. 311—315. Edit. 1852.

"St. Austin says 'No man eats the flesh of Christ, but he that first worships it.' And there are like expressions in Ambrose, Chrysostom, and some other ancient writers. But then they sufficiently explain their own meaning, giving us to understand, that they neither speak of oral manducation, nor of adoring Christ as corporeally present in the Eucharist, but as spiritually present, or else as corporeally absent in heaven. St. Chrysostom says, 'They fell down before Christ their King as captives in baptism, and that they cast themselves down upon their knees before Him. And yet no one would conclude, therefore, that they worshipped Him as corporeally present in baptism, although baptism made them partakers of His body and blood also. He says further, 'That the King himself bowed his body, because of God speaking in the holy Gospels.' But it would be ridiculous hence to infer, either that they worshipped the gospels, or Christ as corporeally present in them." (Bingham, book xv., chap. v. § 5, vol. v., p. 254.)

"*Here*, saith honest Minucius, *Pagans melt brass, they cast it, they set it up, they fasten it; 'tis yet no God: they polish it, they adorn it: neither is it yet a God. But see now, they consecrate it, and pray to it, then as soon as men will have it to be a God, it is a God.* Was this wise man blind, not to see that Pagans might return the same raillery? Christians sow wheat, they cut, gather, and thresh it, 'tis no Christ yet: they grind it, they sift it, they bake it; 'tis but a

wafer; they set it upon an Altar, they elevate it, and cross it several times; no wonder yet: at last they speak five words upon it, presently ten Miracles break forth, and among an hundred wafers, which are all like one to another, that which they are pleased to think upon, is their *Saviour*. Where was the wit and judgment of holy Fathers, St. Chrysostom, Arnobius, Tertullian, (if they had then Rome's Mass worship) when they charged Pagans with flat madness, for lodging their Gods in Images, or for dreaming of consecrations, which might turn the fate of vile materials into gods, or shut these venerable Gods in vile vessels; not perceiving in the mean while, that if Christians did then what Roman Catholics do now, both ancient Christians and new Catholics fall visibly to worse follies?" (Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass, by Dan. Brevint, D.D., 1673, pp. 95, 96. See Bishop Morton on Eucharist, book vii., chap. 8, especially p. 548. Edit. 1635.)

Archbishop Sharp makes the same quotation from Minucius Felix, and says, "If the practice of the pagans in this matter was absurd and ridiculous, then every jot as much was the practice of the Christians, and might have been as easily made appear so, and would without doubt have been made so, had there been any such practice among them." (Works, Edit. Oxford, 1829, vol. v., p. 253.)

"Let the upholders of it [the worship due to a Personal Presence on the Altar] produce a *single instance* from the ancient Communion Offices* of a prayer, or even an invocation, so addressed. It cannot be done. Or if there be found such an one lurking in some remote corner of a Liturgy, its manifest departure from the whole tone and bearing of the rest of the Office stamps it at once as late and unauthoritative." (Archdeacon Freeman's Rites and Ritual, pp. 36, 37.)

"The ancient Liturgies throughout speak of that which is consecrated, and lies upon the Altar, as *Things*, and *not as a person*. But if it be Christ Himself that lies there, is it reverent to speak of HIM as 'Things,' 'Offerings,' or even as 'Mysteries'?" (Ibid, p. 37. See Morton on Eucharist, book viii., chap. 1.)

* Speaking of the Ancient Liturgies L'Arroque says, "It must be confessed that it is a wonderful thing if this religious Adoration had been in use, that neither one nor another should say anything of it, the action being of moment sufficient not to be forgotten in such ample and exact descriptions, as those be which are contained in these Liturgies." (L'Arroque "History of the Eucharist." Walker's Translation, 1684, p. 566.)

"Let these words of S. Chrysostom's Liturgy be especially pondered: 'Hear us. O Lord Jesus Christ, out of Thy Holy Dwelling-place, and from the *Throne of the glory of Thy Kingdom;* Thou that sittest above with the Father, and here art invisibly present with us: and by Thy mighty Hand *give us to partake* of Thy spotless body and Thy precious blood.' Is it not perfectly certain from hence, that, in the conception of antiquity, Our Blessed Lord *was* NOT lying personally upon the altar? that, personally, He was, as regards His Majestic Presence, on His Throne in heaven? And as regards His Mysterious Presence on earth, it was to be sought, *not in or under the Elements*, but (according to the proper law of it) in and among the faithful, the Church of God there present?"* (Ibid, p. 38. See Bishop Morton on Eucharist, book vii., chap. 4, sect. 2, pp. 525—527. Edit. 1635.)

"Mr. Keble tells us that Eucharistical Adoration assumes the Real, by which he means the Objective Presence. When he enters upon the historical evidence for the practice, he begins with the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem, going therefore no higher than the middle of the fourth century. And as to the Liturgies, though he endeavours to meet the objection supplied by his own acknowledgment, he candidly admits the 'omission of the subject (of Eucharistical Adoration) in the Primitive Liturgies,' which, he says, 'are almost or altogether silent as to any worship of Christ's body and blood after consecration. We find in them neither any form of prayer addressed in special to the Holy Humanity so present, nor any Rubric enjoining adoration inward or outward.'

If, however, the doctrine of Eucharistical Adoration rests upon the assumption of the Objective Presence, as Mr. Keble himself says it does, the objection drawn from this silence, so far as it militates against the one, must be equally valid against the other." (Bishop of Llandaff's Charge, 1869, p. 122.)

* "Deus nusquam præcepit panis consecrati adorationem. Est ergo ἐθελοθρησκέια. Pulchre Chrysostomus homil. 51, in Matth: *Discamus, Christum ex ipsius voluntate honorare, Nam qui honoratur, eo maxime honore lætatur, quem ipse vult, non quem nos optamus.*" (Gerhard's *Confessio Catholica*, ii., p. 998. Jena, 1661.)

Note F F, p. 465.

In the articles of 1553, the 28th Article contained the following: "Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one and the self same man cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place. Therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places. And because (as holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not, either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." It is impossible not to observe the similarity between this and the Black Rubric. Both condemned *in words* "The Real Presence." And both were removed in the reign of Elizabeth. But while thus we may be glad that all condemnation of the words "Real Presence" was removed; we may be thankful also that the *doctrine* intended by the words "Real Presence" in the previous article, was excluded by the introduction of another article (the 29th) which applied a severer test of doctrine, than any condemnation of the words "Real Presence" which were of doubtful signification. Burnet says of the words substituted in the 28th Article "This seemed to be MORE THEOLOGICAL and it does indeed *amount to* THE SAME THING." (See Burnet on 39 Articles, p. 409. Edit. Oxford, 1831.)

Bishop Forbes (on Articles, vol. ii., p. 580) makes an argument from Queen Elizabeth's own faith with regard to the Sacrament, and quotes from Heylin, that "when one of her divines had preached a sermon in defence of the REAL PRESENCE on the day commonly called Good Friday, in 1565, she openly gave him thanks for his pains and piety." (See Rev. L. Rivington's "Inward part or thing signified," p. 15.) The same argument has been used before by one who urged that "Dr. Heylin and others have observed of this Queen, that she was a *zealous propugner* of the REAL PRESENCE." To which this reply was given by Archbishop Wake, "Which may be *very true*, and yet but LITTLE TO THE PURPOSE, if she propugned it in the same sense that her brother King Edward the VIth and the Church of England *had done before*, and not in the NEW NOTION imposed upon her by this

author, but WITHOUT ANY MANNER OF PROOF to warrant his suggestion." (Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 64.)

We may gather somewhat of the wide difference between the "Real Presence" of Queen Elizabeth and the "Real Objective Presence" of our day, from what the same historian (Heylin) tells us of her command, before she adopted any decided measures of Reformation "She had commanded the Priest or Bishop (for some say it was the one, and some the other), who officiated at the altar in the Chapel-Royal, not to make any elevation of the Sacrament, the better to prevent that adoration which was given unto it, and which she *could not suffer* to be done in her sight without a most *apparent wrong to her judgment and conscience.*" (History of Reformation. E. H. S. Edit. vol. ii., p. 272.) Lingard tells us that when Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, declined to obey this order, saying that "his life was the Queen's, but his conscience was his own," the Queen "rising immediately after the Gospel, retired with her attendants." (See Lingard's History of England. Edit. 1855, Dolman, vol. vi., pp. 4, 5; and note in Heylin as above; also notes in Heylin, vol. ii., pp. 316, 317.)

Indeed directions had been issued, forbidding the Elevation of the host, before the proclamation of Dec. 27, 1558, against innovations without authority. And Hallam supposes that the refusal of the bishops to officiate at her coronation (Jan. 14, 1558-9) arose from the Queen's order that the host should not be elevated. (See Hallam's Constitutional History, vol. i., p. 110. Edit. 1867.)

Parsons says that Elizabeth accounted Zwingle and his followers as *saints* (Responsio ad Edictum Reg: Angl., p. 165. Rome, 1593) and that the English regarded the doctrine of Zwingle Œcolampadius and Calvin as the truth of the Gospel. (Ibid, p. 292, "quam Angli pro veritate Evangelica tuentur.") And he sets down the Lutheran condemnation of the Reformed (the *Secta Zuingliana*) as the "Lutheranorum judicium de religione Anglicana," (p. 292, Margin.)

And Sanders also, though he seems rather to aim at fastening something of a Lutheran *odium* on Elizabeth's proceedings, (see pp. 293, 294, 302, 303) writes thus:—"Tremendum missæ sacrificium, cum reliquo omni Sanctissimo ritu precandi, et sacramenta administrandi abolet; et nova sacra, ceremonias, precesque in lingua vulgari ad normam maxime Lutheranorum (hoc solo excepto, quod

imagines sacras sustulerit) præscribit, licet *fides Calvini* majis tum, et deinceps ab istis legislatoribus eorumque ministris et sectatoribus sit approbata." (Sanders "De Schismate Angl.," p. 279. Ingolstadt, 1587.)

Moreover Neal, while desiring to represent Elizabeth as almost a Papist in respect of her fondness for ceremonial observances, acknowledges that the *doctrine* she approved was that of the Reformed Churches. (See History of Puritans, vol. i., p. 383.)

It will assist the reader, perhaps, to form a judgment, as to whether Elizabeth *was* on the Lutheran side of the sacramental controversy, and as to whether the Church of England in her reign stood in any doubtful position in this matter, to read the following extracts from the Speech (as given in Hospinian) which Elizabeth's ambassador made, under her instructions, with reference to the *Formula concordiæ*—"Consultum duxit [Serenissima Angliæ Regina] Me ad Celsitudines vestras mittere . . . ut interederem . . . ne talis aliqua Censura et Conventus fiant, per quos non tantùm paucis in Germania Ecclesiis, sed omnibus quæ sunt in Regno Galliæ, Angliæ, Hiberniæ, Scotiæ, Poloniæ, Hungariæ, Helvetiæ, et aliis multis locis præjudicium fiat, quæ a dicta formula diversum sentiunt." (Concordia Discors: in Works, vol. v., p. 147. Geneva, 1678. See also, pp. 148, b. and 149, a.)

Still more important it is to observe the prominent position taken by the English Ambassadors in the assembly of the Reformed held at Frankfort on Maine (1577) for the purpose of thwarting the designs of the Lutheran party. (See Hospinian, Concordia Discors, in Works, vol. v., pp. 143—145.)

The reader may be asked specially to observe the petition to Elizabeth, as to the nursing-mother of the Churches, and holding the highest place among the Reformed Princes, to send a Theologian to assist in drawing up a common confession of faith for all the Reformed Churches. Hospinian says, "Omnibus placuit I. Ut Illustrissimus Princeps Dux Casimirus totius Conventus nomine humiliter rogetur, ne gravetur Serenissimæ Reginæ Angliæ, velut primariæ Ecclesiarum Nutrici atque fautrici, et quæ primum inter Principes, puriorem religionem profitentes, locum obtinet, scribere, et ab ejus Majestate petere, ut ad hujus Confessionis conscriptionem, Theologum unum in Germaniam mittere dignetur, qui una cum aliis, huic tam neces-

sario operi incumbat." (Works, vol. v., p. 145. a. Geneva, 1678.)

There is evidence also of Elizabeth's high esteem for John A Lasco (see Gorham's Reformation gleanings, p. 402); and of her desire to have P. Martyr in England, *after* reading his treatise on the Eucharist. (Ibid, pp. 392, 382.)

Perhaps the following extract from Strype's Life of Aylmer may not be out of place here as tending yet further to show what sort of reception the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist met with in England in Elizabeth's Reign. Strype has been describing the alarm occasioned by the publication of "The discovery of a gaping gulph, whereinto England is like to be swallowed up by another French Marriage, if the Lord forbid not the Banns." Then he says, "It was therefore thought convenient to send a hasty Dispatch to London to the Bishop there, to summon the Clergy for the better pacifying these matters. And on a sudden September 27, 1579, on Sunday at one of the Clock, the Clergy of the City were called unto the Bishop's Palace, where forty of them appeared: Then the Bishop, the Dean of Paul's being present and assistant, told them the Occasion of his sudden calling for them was, to admonish them of two things Chiefly. The former was of one *Andreas Jacobus*, a *Dutch-man*, and as it seems a Minister of the Strangers Church in London: who was a *Lutheran*, or an *Ubiquitary*, as they now stiled them, who were for the Real Presence: and had caused great quarrels among the Strangers, Preachers. He warned them to take heed, how they gave ear to the Sophistical Arguments of him, or any such like." (Strype's Aylmer, pp. 62, 63. London, 1701.)

Note G G, p. 466.

Not that they had any objection to it. They say—"This rubric is not in the Liturgy of Queen Elizabeth, nor confirmed by law; nor is there any great need of restoring it, the world being now in more danger of profanation than idolatry. Besides, the sense of it is declared sufficiently in the 28th Article of the Church of England."

(Cardwell's Conferences, p. 354.) So L'Estrange, giving reasons for kneeling, says—"As the fear of reverting to Popish *idolatry* is *altogether vain*, so the danger of apostatizing from Christ is very great." (Alliance of Divine Offices, Edit. Oxford, p. 323.) And of the Rubric he says—"How, by whom, or upon what account, and inducement, this EXCELLENT RUBRIC, anciently called 'a protestation touching the gesture of kneeling,' came to be omitted in Queen Elizabeth's Liturgy, I cannot determine, and would gladly learn.'" (Ibid, p. 329.) Bishop Cosin says*—"Because the body and blood is neither sensibly present (nor *otherwise* AT ALL PRESENT, but only to those who are duly prepared to receive them, and in the very act of receiving them and the consecrated elements together, to which they are sacramentally united), the adoration is then and there given to Christ Himself, *neither is* nor *ought to be* directed to *any external sensible object*, such as are the *blessed elements*." (In Nicholls's Additional Notes on Communion Service, p. 49.) Of *elevation* Bishop Cosin says—"Which rite neither we, nor any of the Reformed or Protestant Churches, observe, but (*in regard of the* PERIL OF IDOLATRY) have wholly omitted it." (Ibid, p. 47.) "Our kneeling," he says, "is ordained *only* to testify and express the inward reverence and devotion of our souls toward our blessed Saviour." (Ibid, p. 49.) All that George Herbert says in "The Country Parson" (quoted by Mr. Keble, "On Eucharistical Adoration," p. 157; Edit. 1867) may† surely be very well and naturally understood in this same sense.

In the Introduction "by way of Preface before Archbishop Laud's Various Readings," ch. viii., among the "Answers" of Mr. T. Hutton to Puritan exceptions, we read (p. 28)—"*Exception* 7. The people are commanded by the Rubrick to receive the sacrament kneeling . . . . which is dangerous. For (1) They say kneeling is worshipping Mark v. 22; Luke viii. 41; Matt. ix. 18).—*Answer*. Kneeling is NOT in those places put for DIVINE *Worship*; for bending the knee, how common it was in the Eastern country is well known, (Gen. xxxiii. 3 and xxiii. 7.) Children do it to their parents, and subjects to their king. [NOTE.—Overall was not the only one who fell on his knees

* As to the views expressed in the earlier series of notes, now attributed to Bishop Cosin, see note above, Paper No. VI., p. 297, note.

† For Herbert's language (as Dean Goode observes, on Euch. ii., p. 883) "is highly figurative and symbolical, or it is blasphemous."

before King James at the Hampton Court Conference.] (2) They say, this kneeling was brought into the sacrament by Antichrist; Pope Honor. III., anno 1220, teaching the people to worship the bread.—*Answer.* The question is NOT of *kneeling* TO *the Sacrament*, but AT *the Sacrament:* the ONE *we* ALLOW, *the* OTHER *we* CONDEMN. Honor. III. first commanded the people, at ELEVATION TIME, to incline and bow themselves, and when the host was carried in PROCESSION." (See Appendix to Nicholls's Common Prayer, Edit. 1712.)*

So Archbishop Secker writes—"It is true we kneel *at* the Sacrament as they [Romanists] do, but for *a very different purpose:* not to acknowledge 'any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood;' as our Church, to *prevent all possibility of misconception*, EXPRESSLY DECLARES; adding that 'His body is in heaven and not here;' but to worship Him who is everywhere present, the invisible God. And this posture of kneeling we by no means look upon as in itself necessary, but as a very becoming appointment, and very fit to

* "As to the Ceremony of *Kneeling at the Communion.* If our Church's Declaration at the end of the Communion Service, will not vindicate her from an unlawful symbolizing with Rome herein, I have nothing to say in her defence. The Declaration is this, *Whereas, etc., etc.* We see that our Church doth here, not only declare that no adoration is in this gesture intended, either to the Elements or to Christ's Corporal Presence under the species of Bread and Wine, but also that, as such a pretence is absurd and contradictious, so the adoring of the Sacramental Bread and Wine, would be Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. . . . So that . . . all the Idolatry and Superstition too, wherewith the Church of Rome hath abused it, is perfectly removed, and 'tis required by our Church merely as a decent Reverend Gesture." ("The Resolution of this Case of Conscience whether the Church of England's Symbolizing so far as it doth with the Church of Rome makes it unlawful to hold Communion with the Church of England?" London, 1683, pp. 48, 49.)

"Kneeling must be judged as fitting and convenient to be used at such a time, when we signify our desires and affections by external Rites and Ceremonies of God's appointment, as when we do it by words, that is, when we say our Prayers. . . . If we do but consider what invaluable Blessings we expect to receive by our worthy partaking of the Consecrated Bread and Wine at the Table of our Lord (such as forgiveness of all our sins, the plentiful communications of His Grace and Spirit, and a Right and Title to Eternal Life) we can't think Kneeling an unmeet and unbecoming Gesture in the act of receiving the Outward Signs and Pledges of this inward and invisible grace. . . . Why should not a submissive lowly deportment of Body suit with this solemnity as well as a humble lowly mind? And *this is that* which our Church *declares* to be the *end and design* of her injunction, in requiring the Communicants to kneel, viz. for a Signification of an humble and grateful acknowledgment of the Benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers." ("The Case of Kneeling at the Holy Sacrament stated and resolved." London, 1683, pp. 52—55.)

accompany the prayers and praises which we offer up at the instant of receiving; and to express that inward spirit of piety and humility on which our partaking worthily of this ordinance, and receiving benefit from it, depend." (Lectures on the Catechism, vol. ii., pp. 252, 253; Edit. 1769.)

So also Kettlewell:—"When we are exercising repentance, and uttering praise, and making solemn prayers and oblations, it is not certainly improper to use such gestures as best become devotions." (Mr. John Kettlewell's Works, 1719, vol. i., p. 463.)

"No posture is necessary, but all, both theirs and ours, are still indifferent. . . . . Thus then is our kneeling posture at the Holy Communion (as all others, *standing* or *sitting*, where that is the fashion) no *unlawful* thing." (Ibid, p. 467.)

"In kneeling at the Holy Sacrament, I say, there is no fear of worshipping the bread, because we do not kneel to it, nor have intention to worship it. If we should kneel down to the bread, indeed, and, submitting ourselves before it, pay divine honour and homage to it, this were really to worship the bread. And this the Papists plainly do. . . . . But although this be *their* intention, yet it is in no case *ours* in kneeling at the Sacrament: for we kneel not to the bread, to give homage and adoration unto it, as our Church has most expressly declared in the Rubrick: so that if any persons intend any such thing, they must not say they follow the Church in that, since in the most earnest and express words it utterly disclaims and warns us all against it; but we use kneeling to a quite different end—viz., only as it is a reverential, humble posture, wherein we may very decently* receive gifts, and make confession of our sins, and give thanks, and pour out our prayers to Almighty God; so that our kneeling is only unto God. . . . . This, I say, *is* ALL *we do* in kneeling at the Holy Sacrament, as the Church *requires*, and as our own consciences bear us witness." (Ibid, pp. 468, 469.)

"To worship the bread, as the Papists do, is to kneel down to it, and to pay divine honour and adoration to it, because they believe Christ bodily present therein; and this may be done in any posture." (Ibid, pp. 469, 470.)

* Compare Hooker—"Coming as receivers of inestimable grace at the hands of God, what doth better beseem our bodies at that hour than to be sensible witnesses of minds unfeignedly humbled?" (Vol. ii., p. 366. Edit. Keble.)

Bishop Burnet says—"Surely there is a great want of ingenuity in them that are pleased to apply these orders of some later Popes for kneeling at the elevation, to our kneeling; when ours is not at one such part, which might be more liable to exception, but during the whole office: by which it is one continued act of worship, and the communicants kneel all the while." (History of the Reformation, Edit. Orr, 1850, vol. i., p. 416.)

"N. In your receiving of the Communion we disallow your Idolatrous kneeling. [*Answer.*] When we pray, kneeling is a gesture most convenient. But in the receiving we do pray by the commandment of the Church. For both the minister prayeth, and we also are commanded to receive it with thanksgiving, which is a kind of prayer: and therefore kneeling cannot be denied to be expedient." (Ambrose Fisher's Defence of the Liturgy, 1630, p. 160.)

"Of kneeling in the act of receiving the Lord's Supper.—I confess that I never saw cause to think this unlawful to be done, and therefore I do it. First, because the Church of England abhorreth all adoration of the Sacrament, and the Papists know it. Secondly, because it holdeth *sitting* or *standing*, to be as lawful and holy as *kneeling*, putting no necessity or worship of God in any of these arbitrary gestures. Yea, because in this Church a prayer is then used for each communicant, this gesture may seem more agreeable to the external arbitrary form here used, than to the fashion of other Churches, whose liberty is not abridged by ours; as not ours, by theirs." (From Dr. Burgess's "Interpretations," of which he declares—"These interpretations King James accepted, and my Lord's Grace of Canterbury *affirmed them to be the true sense and intention of the Church of England.*" See "An Answer Rejoyned; by Dr. John Burgess," 1631, pp. 25, 26; also p. 273. See also, Paper No. VI. pp. 311, 312.)

So Bishop Hall:—"This is our gesture of reverence in our prayer at the receipt . . . . . not of idolatrous adoration of the bread." (Works, vol. ix., pp. 439, 440; Edit. Pratt, 1808.) Again:—"They [the Papists] direct their devotions, at the best, *by* the crucifix, *to* their Saviour; we do *not so* by the bread: we kneel no more to the bread than to the pulpit when we join our prayers with the minister's." (Ibid, p. 440. See also p. 487.)

"He must have the knee of a camel, and heart of oak, that will

not bow himself, and after the manner of adoration and worship say Amen (as S. Cyrill speaks) to so pathetical a prayer and thanksgiving, made by the minister unto God in his behalf. And this is a powerful argument indeed for conformity in this point: with the which I have seen some Leicestershire people of good sort, that had been refractory for a long time, satisfied in an instant by the Bishop of the diocese, being very sorry they had not observed so much before,—that in the Church of England, our whole act of receiving is accompanied in every part with the act of praying and thanksgiving." ("The Holy Table—Name and Thing," pp. 135, 136; Edit. 1637.)

So Archbishop Whitgift had said in reply to Cartwright's objections—"You should have learned that the *whole action* of this Supper is a thanksgiving, and therefore it is called *Eucharistia;* so that kneeling is a convenient gesture for it *during the whole time** of the celebration." (Works, vol. iii., pp. 91, 92.)

When Cartwright spoke of avoiding "the danger of idolatry," (p. 93,) Whitgift replied—"There is no such peril in kneeling at the Communion as you surmise; for the gospeller is better instructed than so grossly to err." (Page 95.)

And so before this Cranmer had written (1552)—"I pray you to consider that there be two prayers which go before the receiving of the Sacrament, and two immediately follow—all which time the people, praying and giving thanks, do kneel. And what inconvenience there is that it may not be thus ordered, I know not. If the kneeling of the people should be discontinued for the time of receiving of the Sacrament, so that at the receipt thereof they should rise up and stand or sit, and then immediately kneel down again—it should rather import a contemptuous than a reverent receiving of the Sacrament." (See J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, Introd., p. xxxii.; and Perry on "Declaration Concerning Kneeling," pp. 77, 78.)

* So Bishop Cosin—"The Communicants kneel during the reception, and indeed to the end of the whole celebration, worshipping, not the Sacrament, but Christ." (Religion of the Church of England." Edit. Meyrick. Rivingtons, p. 44.)

Cosin desired to have this practice distinctly enjoined. In his paper of "particulars to be considered," it is set down "LX. There wants likewise an Order, for the People to continue kneeling at their Prayers and Devotions (as is most meet) during all the time of the holy Action." (See Nicholls's Additional Notes, etc., p. 69.)

Note H H, see p. 467.

Mr. Perry has written a volume of 442 pages 8vo. with the view of reconciling "The Declaration concerning Kneeling" with the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence."

I cannot say what effect this volume may have upon other minds. But I must say, that upon *one* mind (which, no doubt, will be regarded by Mr. Perry, as very prejudiced) it has left the impression of the *weakness* of the position, which is here with so much ability maintained.

If any should desire to see evidence to show that the Declaration was *not* understood as directed *only* against any *such* a particular *conception* of the presence, it will suffice, I think, to ask attention to the following extract from the writings of an ardent admirer and an able defender of the well-known non-juror Dr. Hickes; a divine whose opinions were (not without some reason, I believe) accounted the *ne plus ultra* of a period which fostered and ripened some extreme *Ultra-Anglican* views.

"I have already declared against the Personal Presence, or Sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharistical elements. Nor do I suppose that the bread and wine *represent* His whole person, as He is God and Man; but only His *sacrificed body* and His *effused blood*. His soul was separated from the body before the sacrifice was consummated. We have in the Sacrament His body and blood consecrated and administered apart, which is a demonstration that we *have* NOT *there His entire living person*. And therefore it doth not follow, that because we have the true and real *representatives* of His body and blood, and that they are as beneficial to us as if we had the Principals, that therefore divine honour is to be paid to them. For I am fully persuaded (to express myself in the words of our Church) that *no adoration* ought to be done, either to the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or to any corporal presence of Christ's body and blood." ("The Propitiatory Oblation in the Eucharist, truly Stated and Defended," p. 31; London, 1710.)

The book was published anonymously, but was attributed to John Johnson, the author of "The Unbloody Sacrifice."

With Johnson's testimony may be compared the following from Bishop George Hooper (of Bath and Wells).

"Kneeling at the communion is far . . . . from being popish; that is, either a corruption or superstition. The Papists, indeed, kneel *to* the host, as *to* their God; but not so particularly then when they receive it, as when, immediately consecration, it is elevated, and shown to them for that purpose by the priest. But we that kneel when we receive the Communion, kneel not *to* it but *at* it. And what posture can there be fitter for those that, in the deepest sense of their own unworthiness, and of God's unexpressible mercy, are going to take the SEAL *of their pardon*, and the PLEDGE *of their salvation?* What better posture would they have for those, that at that time are to be in the highest acts of devotion, the most relenting contrition, and the most dutiful thanksgiving? If on that occasion the papists kneel too, and with a wrong intention, why should any fault of theirs hinder me from expressing my duty? What they do on no reason, why should not I do on the best; especially when we have *so solemnly* DISCLAIMED *theirs, and so expressly declared our own*? As we are not to disuse the holy Sacrament because the papists have made it an idol, so may *we* continue our *reverence*, though *they* have paid it *adoration*." (Works, vol. i., p. 8; Edit. Oxford, 1855.)

Further evidence will be found above, pp. 472, 473, 572, 573.

It will be seen, I think, that this Declaration was regarded by our English Divines as such a sufficient and unmistakeable disclaimer of anything like the Eucharistic worship of the Church of Rome, as ought not only to be an effectual safeguard against all thought of directing worship to the elements, or any divine presence in or under the elements, but also to repel all charges made against the Church of England of running the risk of having her injunction of kneeling so misunderstood as to lead to any such adoration. (See Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 374; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

It was in their judgment a grievous wrong to the Church of England, to lay to her such a charge. It was to charge her with that from which this rubric ought quite unmistakeably to have cleared her.

What would these English divines have thought, if they had been told that among the Church of England's own sons would rise those who would actually seek to introduce into the practice of the Church of England that adoration, the very risk of which they judged to be removed for ever—and would maintain that this rubric contained no

condemnation of any such presence, or of any such adoration of that presence, as was taught by the Church of Rome?

Note II, p. 468.

When Dr. Pusey says—"Plainly, the word 'corporal,' which they admitted, could not in their minds mean the same as 'real and essential,' which they rejected," (Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 224; see also Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 321; and Grueber's Reply to Dr. Heurtley, p. 330, sqq.; and Bishop Forbes on Articles, ii., p. 547)—he seems to have overlooked the fact, that the two phrases having been often used as *convertible*, there might be very good reason for preferring to express the *same thing* in language which our Divines *never* claimed as their own, rather than in language which, as applied to Eucharistic reception, many eminent Divines *had claimed* for ourselves and for the doctrine of our Reformed Church.

That the change from "real and essential" to "corporal presence" was not without sufficient cause, will be apparent, I think, to all who will observe—

(1) That in the earlier period of the English Reformed Church the expression "Real Presence" unexplained was commonly rejected by our Reformers, and regarded as expressing the Romish doctrine, though doubtless with explanation it was sometimes accepted by them. The following examples may be taken in proof of this.

Cranmer speaks of "the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of *the Real Presence*." (On Lord's Supper, p. 6.) And again he says—"Not long before I wrote the said Catechism, I was in that error of the Real Presence." (Ibid, p. 374.)

Ridley says—"The blood is in the chalice indeed, but NOT IN THE REAL PRESENCE, but by grace and in a sacrament." (Works, p. 238.)

Jewel argues at length against "the Real Presence," and speaks of "these NEW-FANGLED WORDS, '*really*,' '*corporally*,' '*carnally*,' etc. Which words M. Harding is not able to show that, in this case of

BEING REALLY in the Sacrament, any one of all the old Fathers ever used." (Sermon and Harding, p. 449.)

So Foxe, speaking of the difference between the Lutherans and the Sacramentaries, says—"They both . . . . do confess the presence of Christ, and disagree only upon the manner of the presence, which the one part do affirm to be *real*, and the other *spiritual*." (Acts and Monuments, vol. v., p. 11.)

Hence in the 29th Article of 1553, we have "real and corporal" coupled as expressive of the doctrine rejected. "A faithful man ought not either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily realem et corporalem) presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood."

(2) That when, in the earlier period of the English Reformed Church, the expression "Real Presence" or "Real Essential Presence" was accepted, it was always accepted with explanation; and that in that explanation the "corporal" or "bodily" or "carnal" presence was commonly excluded.

It is true indeed that in 1555 Bradford accepted the words "corporally present," with explanation (Sermons, etc., p. 480), and that Dean Aldrich acknowledges the words as capable of being used in a sound sense. (Quoted in Goode on Eucharist, i., p. 39.) But the example must be regarded as exceptional, and unsupported by the use of succeeding Divines.

Thus Ridley, accepting "A REAL PRESENCE" (p. 213), explains that if meant of "the real and CORPORAL substance," THAT presence "cannot be on the earth," and (p. 236) denies that it is "by the CORPORAL presence of the body of His flesh." But (p. 274) he acknowledges the presence, "vere et realiter," for "SPIRITUALLY, by grace and efficacy." Again, he speaks of "A SPIRITUAL *presence* by grace, and not after any CORPORAL SUBSTANCE of His flesh taken of the Virgin Mary." (Page 249.)

Thus Latimer acknowledges "none other presence than a SPIRITUAL presence;" but adds, "The same may be called a REAL Presence." (Remains, p. 252.)

Thus Philpot acknowledges "a very ESSENTIAL presence"—yea, "a REAL presence" (p. 130)—but denies the being present "bodily." (Page 208.)

Thus Hooper acknowledges "Christum . . . . adesse, . . . quoad corporis ejus *gratiam*, sed NON quoad *corporis* ejus SUBSTANTIAM." (Later Writings, p. 394.)

Thus Haddon: "Corpus Christi REALITER adest Sacramentis corporis et sanguinis sui vere ex Christi institutione administratis. Intellige REALITER pro *vere et non ficte*, sacramentaliter NON *autem* CARNALITER." (Haddon's Opinion of the Presence, 1553; given in Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ix., 301.)

Thus Hooker:—"They [the ancient Fathers] teach that Christ is PERSONALLY there PRESENT—yea, *present whole*, albeit a part of Christ be CORPORALLY ABSENT from thence." (Keble Edit., vol. ii., p. 357.)

(3) That when subsequent English Divines claimed and appropriated the phrase "Real Presence," as expressing the doctrine of our Church, they did not thus claim and appropriate the phrase "Corporal Presence," which was thus left to express that doctrine of the opponents, which had at an earlier period been expressed by the phrase "Real Presence."

Thus Jeremy Taylor, in his treatise on "The Real Presence," says—"I suppose we do in no sense prevaricate this so pious and prudent counsel by saying, THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IS REAL AND SPIRITUAL." (The capitals are his own. Sec. i., 2.) And though he acknowledges that the word "corporally" may become "warrantable and consonant to our doctrine," yet he says (sec. i., 9)—"That which seems of hardest explication is the word *corporaliter*, which I find that Melancthon used; saylng, *Corporaliter quoque communicatione carnis Christi Christum in nobis habitare;* which manner of speaking I have heard he avoided after he had conversed with Œcolampadius, who was able then to teach him and most men in that question." (See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 70.)

So Bishop Morton, while maintaining, like Taylor, "the Real Presence," devotes the *fourth* book of his work on the Eucharist to "The Corporal Presence," the title of which is—"Treating of the Second Romish Consequence, arising from the False Exposition of these words of Christ ["This is my body"] called CORPORAL PRESENCE in the Sacrament of the Eucharist." And the second section of the first chapter is headed thus: "That Protestants, albeit they *deny the* CORPORAL PRESENCE *of Christ* in this Sacrament; yet hold they a

TRUE *Presence* thereof in divers respects; according to the judgment of antiquity."

Bishop Andrewes says—"Præsentiam (inquam) credimus, nec minus quam vos, veram. De modo præsentiæ nil temere definimus; non magis quam, in baptismo nostro, quomodo abluat nos sanguis Christi." (Responsio ad Bellarm., p. 13.)

On which words Archbishop Wake has said—"He [Andrewes] plainly insinuates that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist was much the same as in Baptism; the very allusion which the holy Fathers were wont to make to express His presence by in this holy Sacrament; which since our adversaries can neither deny, nor yet say is *so real* as to be *essential or* CORPOREAL, they must of necessity allow, that there may be a true presence (which is all the Bishop affirms) without such a substantial one as this author here contends for." (Archbishop Wake's "Discourse of the Holy Eucharist," in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 69. See also pp. 70, 71.)

L'Estrange speaks of "that REAL *presence* which all sound Protestants seem to allow." (Alliance of Divine Offices, Edit. Oxford, p. 323.) But the phrase CORPORAL *Presence* was distinctly disallowed by Archbishop Laud. (See Bulley's Variations, p. 184.)

Hammond says—"Bestowing that body and blood of Christ upon us . . . . REALLY." (Hammond's Practical Catechism, p. 129.) "The faithful do receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, which implies not any CORPORAL PRESENCE of Christ on the table or in the elements, but God's communicating the crucified Saviour (who is in Heaven bodily, and no where else) to us sinners on the earth." (Ibid, p. 126.)

In like manner, Archbishop Laud (Conference with Fisher, p. 247) says—"PROTESTANTS OF ALL SORTS *maintain a true and* REAL *presence* of Christ in the Eucharist." But the seventh English Canon of 1640 disclaims "any opinion of a CORPORAL *Presence* of the body of Jesus Christ, on the holy table, or in mystical elements." (Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., p. 406.)

Again — Archbishop Laud quotes with approval the words of Cranmer: "If you understand by this word REALLY, *reipsa;* that is, in *very deed and effectually;* so Christ, by the grace and *efficacy of His passion,* IS *indeed and truly* PRESENT, etc. But if by this word *really* you understand CORPORALITER, CORPORALLY in His natural and

organical body, under the forms of bread and wine, it is CONTRARY TO THE HOLY WORD OF GOD." (Conference with Fisher, p. 248.)

Heylin gives it as the ground for the omission of this rubric (as well as for the change in the form of administration) in Elizabeth's reign, "lest, under colour of rejecting a *carnal*, they might be thought also to deny SUCH a *Real Presence* as was defended in the writings of the ancient Fathers." (History of Reformation, E. H. S. Edit., pp. 285, 286.)

So John Owen says—"One of the greatest engines that ever the devil made use of to overthrow the faith of the Church, was, by forging *such a presence of Christ* as is *not truly* in this ordinance, to drive us off from looking after *that great presence* which is TRUE. I look upon it as one of the greatest engines that ever hell set on work. It is NOT *a* CORPOREAL *presence*. Every thing that is in sense, reason, and the faith of a man, overthrows that CORPOREAL *presence*." (Works, Edit. Goold, vol. ix., p. 572.) Yet Owen speaks of Christ as REALLY *exhibited*" and "REALLY *communicated*," (p. 617,) and "*the reception* . . . . REALLY." (Page 621.)

(4) Add to this, that the phrase "CORPORAL PRESENCE" was accepted and pleaded for by Lutherans, as expressing the doctrine which was held in common by themselves, the Roman Church, and the Greek Church, (see quotations in Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 624,) but not by the Reformed, who yet did not reject the phrase "Real Presence."

Ursinus says "Isthæc *præsentia* ac perceptio tum corporis tum sanguinis Domini, tametsi *spiritualis* NON *corporalis*, nec oralis est; *essentialis* tamen ac *vera* est." (Solida Refutatio Cavillationum Theol. Wirtemb: in Works, vol. ii., p. 363. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.) Again, "Confitendo VERAM *præsentiam* . . . . multum abest, ut *corporalem*, oralem . . . confiteri quis præsumatur." (Ibid, p. 367.)

The *Declaratio Thoruniensis* also (1645) in like manner, clearly confesses a most *real*, while distinctly denying a *corporal* Presence. It says, "Nequaquam etiam negamus *veram* Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Cœna Præsentiam, sed tantum localem et *corporalem* Modum, et Unionem cum Elementis substantialem: ipsam vero nobiscum Præsentiam sancte Credimus, et quidem non imaginariam,

sed verissimam, *realissimam* et efficacissimam." (In Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 682. See above, §. 7.)

"All," says D'Aubignè, concluding the account of the Conference at Marburg—"Romanists and Evangelicals, Saxons and Swiss—admitted the presence, and even the REAL PRESENCE, of Christ." (History of the Reformation, p. 346.) But in the preceding page we have Luther's words, declaring—"We are not agreed on the subject whether the real body and blood of Christ are CORPOREALLY present in the bread and wine." (See Edgar's Variations of Popery, p. 7; and especially Hospinian, vol. iv., pp. 128, 129.)

The "Consensus Orthodoxus" of Gualter speaks of the calumny gainst the Reformed, "Quod *veram* Christi in cœna *præsentiam* negent, quasi non aliter quam per *corporalem* carnis *præsentiam*, sacramentis suis vere adesse possit Christus." (Edit. 1605, p. 255.) Again:—"Etsi *præsentia* Christi non sit *corporalis*, recte tamen dici potest esse *realis*." (Ibid, p. 259.)

In the Westminster Confession of Faith it is said—"The body and blood of Christ being then, NOT CORPORALLY or carnally, in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as REALLY, but spiritually, PRESENT to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as elements themselves are to their outward senses." (Edit. 1658, p. 100.)

(5) Add yet the following statements from men* who were themselves engaged in the last review of the Prayer Book, at which the Black Rubric was restored.

"We teach also a REAL PRESENCE of Christ's body . . . . . by the means of the *real operation* and *effectual efficacy* of GRACE." (Sheldon, Bp. London: quoted in Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 54.)

"It is not the taking of Christ's body into our mouths, in the very flesh or CORPOREAL *substance* of it (if it could be so taken) that can nourish us spiritually . . . but it is the *Spirit*, saith *Christ*, that *quickeneth*, that is, it is the SPIRITUAL *eating* of His flesh and drink-

* Sheldon and Morley and Reynolds had previously been on the Savoy Commission. Morley and Nicholson were on the Commission appointed by the Upper House of Convocation to prepare the Book for revision. (See Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 370, 371.) This Committee, however, appears to have been almost superseded by the action of Convocation itself. (See Cardwell, p. 371.)

ing of His blood, that nourisheth us." (Bishop Morley of Worcester, quoted in Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 53.)

Bishop Reynolds (the writer, probably, of our General Thanksgiving—see Cardwell's Conf., p. 372), affirming it to be "both absurd and impious" to affirm Christ "really and CORPORALLY present with the consecrated elements, severed from the act of faithful receiving," yet declares—"A REAL *presence* of Christ we acknowledge, but not local or physical; for *presence* REAL (that being a metaphysical term) is not opposed unto a mere physical or local absence or distance, but is opposed to a false, imaginary, fantastic presence;" adding—"What presence fitter for a spiritual union than a SPIRITUAL *presence?*" (Meditations on the Holy Sacrament; in Works, Edit. 1826, vol. iii., pp. 69, 72, 73.)

Bishop Nicholson says—"This presence of His is REAL, ... for He is TRULY and EFFECTUALLY there present, though NOT CORPORALLY, BODILY, carnally, locally." (Nicholson, Bp. Gloucester: Exposition of Catechism, p. 217.)

The following testimonies may be added as showing that the distinction was preserved by succeeding Divines. "This REAL PRESENCE of Christ in the sacrament, His Church hath always believed. But the monstrous notion of HIS BODILY PRESENCE was started 700 years after His death." (Archbishop Secker, quoted in Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 724.)

"The body and blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful, not substantially, not CORPORALLY, but verily and indeed, that is, effectually. The sacred symbols are no bare signs, no untrue figures of a thing absent; but the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefit of Christ's body broken and blood shed, that is, of His passion, are really and effectually present with all them that receive worthily. This is all the REAL Presence that our Church teaches." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 42.)

Much more evidence of the same kind might be adduced, but more seems to be needless.

At a time when the phrase "Real Presence" had come to signify a doctrine which was acknowledged to be held by *Protestants generally*, (see Paper No. VI., p. 371) even those most opposed to anything like the Real Objective Presence; at a time when "the Corporal Presence" was commonly understood to be the designation of the doctrine of

Papists and Lutherans—it were strange indeed, if the change made in the "Declaration" were to be regarded as unaccountable save on the supposition of its being no longer condemnatory of the doctrine taught by Papists and Lutherans.

I add the following valuable observation of Dean Goode:—"One great point for which our divines have contended in opposition to Romish errors, has been the reality of that presence of Christ's body and blood to the soul of the believer which is effected through the operation of the Holy Spirit, notwithstanding the absence of the substance of that body and blood in heaven. Like the sun, the body of Christ is both present and absent: present, really and truly present, in one sense: that is, by the soul being brought into immediate communion with; but absent in another sense, that is, as regards the contiguity of its substance to our bodies. The Authors under review, like the Romanists, maintain that this is not a real presence; and, assuming their own interpretation of the phrase to be the only true one, press into their service the testimony of divines who, though using the phrase, apply it in a sense the reverse of theirs. The ambiguity of the phrase, and its misapplication by the Church of Rome, have induced many of our divines to repudiate it, and our Church, as Dean Aldrich has observed, has wisely forborne its use; but others, for the similar purpose of preventing misconception and meeting the misrepresentations of the Romanists, have maintained and contended for its use. The real doctrine of our divines, therefore, is not to be sought in their use or rejection of this phrase, but in the meaning they attach to it, and their accompanying statements." (Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 757. See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., chap. ii.)

Mr. S. C. Malan justly observes (in his work entitled "The Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to Scripture, Grammar and the Faith."—Nutt.)

"The offence some people take at the words 'Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament,' comes from mistaking them. Both Papists and Anglicans use the term 'Real Presence;' the Papists—whether some of the Ritualists, who seem to make a distinction without a difference, differ much from them, I cannot tell—mean by 'Real Presence' that Christ is materially present in the Bread and Wine, or rather that these symbols are changed into His natural

flesh and blood; so that they materially and mechanically eat and drink Him: a doctrine so gross, and so forbidding, that the mind turns away with disgust from it, as also from the details into which those who hold it are obliged to enter.

Whereas Anglicans, such as Jeremy Taylor, Hooker, and other like sober-minded men, understand by Real Presence in the Sacrament, not that Christ forms part of the elements, which after the consecration remain in every respect unchanged, in form, nature, and substance, as Theodoretus says, but that Christ is then especially present in a spiritual or sacramental manner, and that He thus verily communicates Himself in His whole Person, as EMMANUEL, God with us, to every faithful partaker of the Lord's Supper: 'the mean,' says Art. XXVIII., 'whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper being—faith.'" (Pages 127-8. See Bishop O'Brien's Charge, 1866, p. 89.)

Understanding then the words "Real Presence," in that sense in which our English Divines have accepted it, and which stands clearly distinguished from the modern "Real Objective Presence," we may acknowledge as true what has been said concerning the final Revisers, that "they retained the protest against Transubstantiation, while they removed all risk of the Declaration, or 'Black rubric,' as it was sometimes called, being understood as even an *apparent* denial of the truth of the Real Presence." (See J. H. Blunt's "Common Prayer," p. 199, note.)

But then it must not be supposed that *such* a Real Presence had ever been denied or called in question by our Reformers.

Note K K, p. 469.

Let it be asked, and submitted to consideration—May not the disallowance of reservation and elevation be itself admissible as evidence towards proving that the Church of England does not hold the Real Objective Presence? For if such a personal adorable presence, under the form of bread, be held, should it not

naturally and rightfully lead to some such provision as is made in the Church of Rome?

Archbishop Sharp has said, "If the consecrated bread be really Christ's body, and His soul and deity be hypostatically united therewith, (as they all teach,) then I cannot see but that *we are bound* to perform divine worship to the elements in the sacrament, or to that which in common speech we Protestants call bread and wine." (Works, Edit. Oxford, 1829, pp. 233, 234. See also p. 260. See the same argument urged by Beza in Tract. Theol., vol. i., pp. 263, 311.)*

"Si apud Catholicos certissimum dogma est, in Eucharistia totum Christum reali sua præsentia existere, quis non videt ac intelligit necessario consequi ipsum ibi esse adorandum, cum ubicunque is præsens adsit, ejusmodi honore et obsequio sit donandus; imo qui secus ageret damnandus foret?" (Migne's Patrologiæ Tomus lxxiv. p. 1007. Paris 1850.)

Let the reader mark what this doctrine does lead to at Rome.

The Extract following is from the Dublin Review of Jan. 1870:

"She [Rome] may be said to be the city of the blessed Sacrament, Its tabernacle and throne. In Rome Its worship is perpetual, unbroken even by a moment's pause; and so scrupulously is this provided for by her anxious love, that the deposition of the Sacred Host is not allowed to take place in one church until after it has been elevated in another. At the beginning of the Church's year, on Advent Sunday, the Lamb of God is lifted up on His Sacramental Throne by His own Vicar's hands, in the Cappella Paolina at the Vatican, and from thence the Blessed Presence passes from Basilica to Church, and from Church to Convent, until well nigh all Rome's holy places have been made holier by the visit of the All Holy.

* A Lasco says—"Si igitur Christi corpus naturale cum inhabitante in se omni divinitatis plenitudine, ita aut elementis cœnæ ipsis, aut ministri operi unitur, ut vel pani ipsi realiter insit, vel manibus ministri distribuatur omnino: Adorari illud certè oportebit, sive in pane ipso, sive in ministri nescio quo opere: si non Christum Dominum sua gloria fraudare velimus." ("Brevis et Dilucida de Sacramentis Ecclesiæ Christi Tractatio,' fo. 132; London, 1552.)

Calvin asks—"Cui persuadebit non esse adorandum panem, qui proprie sit Christus?" (Works, vol. viii., p. 727 *b*; Amsterdam, 1667.)

Ursinus says—"Si Christus in pane Eucharistico præsens esset corporaliter, necessario nos ad panem conversos, oporteret ipsi reverentiam et adorationem Deo debitam exhibere." (Works, vol. ii., p. 664 *b*; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

What a thought it is! He Who gave strength to Peter, and conversion to Paul, and purity to Agnes, and victory to all Rome's saints, comes now during that year of ceaseless worship, and rests for forty hours with unspeakable complacency on their glorious shrines! And not an hour of day or night but the poorest, and lowliest, and most forgotten of Rome's children can have audience of the King of Heaven in the city of His saints! Not a morning but the sun rises upon countless altars, upon which the Lamb of God is lying, as it were, slain, and at which God and man are being brought together in His Kiss of Peace; not an evening is which the Sun sinks in glory beneath the western heaven, but the Sun of Justice, which never sets, casts His silent benediction upon kneeling crowds! And he who would have gathered Jerusalem's now scattered children, even as the hen doth her brood, gathers Now at Rome the children of her who was once the 'Great Harlot,' under the shadow of His wings!" (Page 41.)

Now, why is there nothing of all this, in our own Communion? Must not the absence arise from one of two causes? Either that like a cruel mother (which none of her children will believe) the Church of England withholds from her children so great a blessing? Or else, that in faithfulness and love she will not suffer her children to be taught to believe this blessing at all; but will lead them from idolatrous altars to the throne of grace, where all real blessing is to be obtained? Surely, then, she herself can hardly hold the doctrine of this Objective Presence. "How could she hold it" it has been well asked "and yet forbear to worship"? (Dr. Heurtley's "Remarks on Declaration," p. 12. See "The Real Presence—the worship due."—Rivingtons. Especially p. 8, 9, 10, and Bishop of St. David's Charge 1869., p. 62, note. See also the "Autobiography" in "The Church and the World," 1866, and Bishop O'Brien's Charge, 1866., p. 112, sqq.)

Note L L, p. 475.

Thus some have gone so far as to desire that our present Communion Service should be replaced by "a good translation of the Liturgy of St. Peter," (*i.e.* the Mass-book.) While others have not hesitated to speak of our present office as "a judgment on the Church." Thus also our Reformers have been charged with mutilating "the tradition of 1500 years," and with giving up altogether "the ecclesiastical tradition regarding certain VERY MATERIAL points in the *celebration*, if not in the doctrine, of the Holy Eucharist." (See Goode's Rule of Faith, vol. ii., p. 363.)

Mr. Orby Shipley (while labouring hard to remove the impression of repugnance between his own views and the teaching of our Liturgy) writes—"It may be well to call to mind to how great an extent the Prayer for Christ's Church, as we now use it, has been *tampered with*, both to the *detriment* of the worshipper, and of the perfection and unity of the Prayer. One part has been contracted, one has been omitted, and one epitomized." (The Church and the World, p. 1866, third Edition, p. 493.) And again, speaking of the Invocation as it appeared in 1549, he says, "This invocation we have lost, and we can *scarcely too deeply* DEPLORE *the loss, or earnestly* DESIRE that it may be restored to us." (Ibid.)

Again Mr. Shipley speaks of "those who in 1552 so GRIEVOUSLY MARRED *the labour of many years*" (p. 476), and of "those *abnormal alterations* from which we still suffer," (p. 477). The revision of 1552 is regarded by him as "the first *deplorable* DEFORMATION of the labours of the Convocation of 1549," (p. 477). He says that "it is the sacred Canon that revision has run to the *freest extent of* RIOT;" that The Consecration "is but a shadow of its earlier self," that "The Canon, *if it be not irreverent to say so*, has been at once *decapitated and curtailed;*" that "it has been *dismembered;* and its dislocated portions have been readjusted with no recognizable organization."* (Page 485.)

* In a more recent work Mr. Orby Shipley speaks of "the need of some 'clothing upon' of the dry bones of the Anglican Office," (Preface to "Ritual of the Altar," p. 35), and of "our mutilated rite for the celebration of sacred mysteries." (Ibid, p. 20.) He regards our Liturgy as only "a wreck of former power, and a shadow of earlier beauty" (Ibid, p. 14),—"a public office, the rules and words of which, oftentimes inadequate, are in some important, though not essential, parts almost defective." (Ibid, p. 17.)

So Mr. Medd speaks of "the *mutilated* and *dislocated* Liturgy of 1552." ("The Church and the World," 1866. Edit. third, p. 313.)

Another writer says that "the *very palpable defects* of our offices, and *principally of our office of offices*, THE EUCHARISTIC SERVICE, are at last coming to be *pretty generally admitted*." (See Blakeney's Common Prayer, Introduction, p. xiv.)

By another it has been said, "It is impossible for any English Liturgical scholar to behold it [our Communion Office] in its present condition and to compare it with the glorious rite of Sarum, or even with Edward VI's First Book, without being *bowed down with* SHAME, GRIEF, and INDIGNATION at the ENORMOUS WRONG-DOING which was *perpetrated*, and the apathy with which it has been so long regarded." (See Principles at Stake, p. 13.)

[The Sarum Missal here alluded to contains the following Rubric, "After these words, let the Priest incline to the Host, and with bowed head adore It, and afterwards elevate It above his forehead that It may be seen by the people, and reverently replace It before the Chalice, making a cross with the same; and then let him uncover the chalice and hold it between both hands, not disjoining the thumb from the forefinger, save only to make the sign of the cross." (Sarum Missal, Church Press Company, p. 311.) Also the following Prayer after the Offertory, "Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which I, an unworthy sinner, offer in Thy honour, Blessed Mary's, and all Thy saints, for my sins and offences; for the salvation of the living and the repose of the faithful departed. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, let this new Sacrifice be acceptable to Almighty God." (Ibid, p. 298.)

Dr. Blakeney says (On Common Prayer, p. 404) "The very reading of this service is its refutation. Dupin says, in reference to the spurious Liturgy, which bears the name of St. James:—'Who will believe that these things were in use in St. James's time?' We may put a similar question as to the Sarum Service, which is . . . more objectionable:—Who will believe that these things were in use in the time of the Apostles?"]

"In 1838 the British Critic solemnly protested, in the name of the party, that they desired no changes in the Prayer Book, and that what had satisfied Andrewes and Laud would for ever satisfy them . . . *now* the desire of 're-appropriating' whatever was deli-

berately expunged from our Liturgy at the Reformation is hardly dissembled; and if men are taught to submit to the present Prayer Book, it is to submit in the same spirit as they would to a famine or a pestilence, or a bill of pains and penalties, or any other inevitable affliction." (Cautions for Times, p. 329.)

What Dr. Brett (whose views did not nearly come up to the "Real Objective Presence") thought of our Communion Service may be seen in his "Liturgies," pp. 396, sqq. He conceives that by her present Communion Service "the present Church of England" has "departed from the communion of the whole Catholic Church." (Page 461.)

Note M M, p. 475.

The Rev. T. T. Carter thus writes, "Our own Office preserves the distinction [between two offerings], though unhappily on this point there has been a deviation from ancient use in the arrangement of the ritual order, owing to a STRONG ULTRA-PROTESTANT *pressure* at the Reformation. . . . In all the Early Liturgies, as in our own First Prayer Book of Edward, it [the Post-Communion Prayer] stood immediately after the Prayer of Consecration. Its removal from this place was intended probably TO DO AWAY WITH *the close connexion of these words with the consecrated Elements.* But we are not bound by the intentions of those who thus *violated the universal custom of the Church;* nor do we receive our Liturgy as interpreted by the changes which they introduced. . . . . No doubt the introduction of the special Roman view of the Real Presence, as it caused a violent reaction against the truth of the Presence itself, so also against the idea of any Sacrifice in the high sense here dwelt on. It was a consequence of this reaction, that *the doctrine of the* SACRIFICE HAS BEEN OBSCURED *in our* PRAYER BOOK; and the *same influence* has acted *very extensively* on our *post-Reformation Divines.* Our *later Theology* has been *greatly influenced* by this reactionary movement." (Correspondence with Marriott. (Rivingtons, Part ii., pp. 88—90.) Here is the confession of one, whom with sincere

regret I must speak of as an opponent. And let the reader mark what this confession amounts to. Is it not a confession of a very considerable portion of what the present Paper has aimed to establish? Surely I am not saying too much or pressing any unnatural deductions out of Mr. Carter's words when I say—Here we have an acknowledgment,

1. Of the *clearing* work of our Reformers as applied to the Sacrificial Character of our Communion Service.

2. Of the *animus*, from which this *clearing* resulted, and of which it is evidence. In Mr. Carter's view it is an "Ultra Protestant" *animus*, shewing itself in a "VIOLENT REACTION against the truth [?] of the Presence" [*i.e.* in the Elements. See p. 90.]

3. Of this same *animus* very extensively pervading our post-Reformation Theology.

4. Of this same *animus*, and its *clearing* work, and therefore [in my view, and I trust, that of my readers, who look at the changes in our Liturgy in connexion with the most obvious historical surroundings] of the character it has stamped on our Communion Service, as being altogether out of tune with the most cherished views of those who maintain "the Real Objective Presence."

I am loth to set down the corollary which to my own mind seems inevitable—that the Principles of those who maintain the "Real Objective Presence" are so repugnant to the Principles of our Reformed Church and to the doctrines for which many of our Reformers laid down their lives, that if we stand on the side of "the Real Objective Presence," we must condemn our Reformers as fanatics, and their work as a violation of God's precious truth. And if, on the contrary, we stand on the side of our Church, our Liturgy, and our Reformers, we must condemn "the Real Objective Presence" and its maintainers as teaching for doctrines, what our Church has rejected as the commandments of men.

The following is from Archbishop Longley: "I will quote something which has occurred within my own special cognizance; we all know the proceedings that are now common, and that statements are constantly made which abundantly prove that there are many who are determined to obliterate from our articles and formularies all traces of the Reformation. I said I would mention something that had occurred in my own diocese. I had a letter from a parent

living at the sea-side, in the hands of whose daughter was placed an Eucharistic Manual which contained these words: they are a prayer at the Holy Communion, after the consecration of the Elements,—'Holy Father, accept the spotless victim which thy servant offers for his own sake and those of all faithful Christians both living and dead, that it may make us worthy of everlasting life.' Now contrast that with our Thirty-first Article. . . . . Put these two side by side, and I do not think any one can venture to say they are not DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED to each other." (Speech in Convocation, Feb. 1868, quoted in Principles at Stake, pp. 18, 19.)

Note N N, p. 476,

"Wherefore to avoid all such needless suppositions and needless perplexities, let us be content to teach only this plain doctrine; that we eat Christ crucified in this Sacrament, as we partake of the merits of His death; and if we thus have part in His crucified body, we are thereby *ipso facto* made partakers of the body glorified; that is, we receive our Lord's body into a closer union than before, and become His members by repeated and stronger ties; provided we come worthily to the holy table, and that there is no just obstacle, on our part, to stop the current of Divine graces. I may shut up this account with the excellent words of Archbishop Cranmer, as follows, only put into the modern spelling, 'The first Catholic Christian faith is most plain, clear, and comfortable, without any difficulty, scruple, or doubt: that is to say, that our Saviour Christ, although He be sitting in heaven, in equality with His Father, is our life, strength, food, and sustenance; who by His death delivered us from death, and daily nourishes and increases us to eternal life. And in token hereof, He hath prepared bread to be eaten, and wine to be drunk of us in His holy Supper, to put is in remembrance of His said death, and of the celestial feeding, nourishing, increasing, and of all the benefits which we have thereby: which benefits through faith and the Holy Ghost, are

exhibited and given unto all that worthily receive the said holy Supper. This the husbandman at his plough, the weaver at his loom, and the wife at her rock, can remember, and give thanks unto God for the same: this is the very doctrine of the Gospel, with the consent wholly of all the old ecclesiastical doctors.'" (Waterland, vol. iv., pp. 609, 610.)

PAPERS

ON THE

EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

No. VIII.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

In our review of the teaching of the English Church, we have been ascending step by step from lower to higher ground. And if, in our upward journey, we have caught sounds from our Church's voice which have spoken clearly on the controversy before us; there can be no question that when we come within the range of her thirty-nine articles "agreed upon for avoiding Diversities of Opinions," her voice strikes upon the ear at once not as a trumpet giving an uncertain sound, but with a clearness and distinctness, such as scarcely leaves any room for the supposition that perchance our ears may have deceived us, or we may not really have understood her voice aright.

Here are the two Articles which bear most directly on the subject.

XXVIII. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

"The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

XXIX. *Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.*

"The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint *Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing."

Now, in viewing these Articles it must be remembered, that it is insisted upon as of the very essence of the "Real Objective" view, that, after consecration, there is, of necessity, under the forms of bread and wine, such a Presence of the real body and blood of Christ, altogether independent of use, independent of participation, as that, in the reception of the Elements, (unless this Presence be withdrawn) there must of necessity be a reception of the body and blood of Christ, quite independent of worthiness, quite independent of faith. According to this view he who partakes of the sacramental sign, he who takes and eats the consecrated elements must needs partake of the *res sacramenti*, must needs take, and eat, and drink the body and blood of Christ.

Let the reader look at these Articles with a view to enquire whether this teaching is their teaching. There can be no question, I think, that his answer, on the *prima facie* view will be "No." He will naturally ask: If these Articles meant to teach this doctrine, why is it said, that there is a partaking of the *res sacramenti*, to such as "rightly, worthily and *with faith* receive" the sacrament? Why is it said that the body and blood of Christ are "given, taken and eaten only after an heavenly and spiritual manner"? Why is it said that "the mean" whereby they are received "is *faith*"? Above all, why is it expressly declared that those who are void of a lively faith, however they may receive the sacrament, eat not Christ's body in the use of the Lord's Supper,* and are *in no wise* partakers of Christ?

* With the teaching of our Church in these Articles (as well as in the Catechism, and the Black Rubric) the reader may be glad to compare the following statements of the Reformed Theologians at the Conference of Thorn, 1645. "Constat igitur hoc Sacramentum Rebus terrenis, Pane et Vino, et Cœlestibus, Corpore et Sanguine

It must be, I think, sufficiently obvious, that in these Articles (as understood in their natural sense) the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence can find nothing to support their own views, nothing which they can truly claim as speaking at all in their favour.*

The first aspect† of this language is too evidently repug-

Domini, quæ diverso quidem modo, utræque autem verissime, realissime ac præsentissime nobis exhibentur; nempe, Terrenæ *modo* Naturali, Corporali et Terreno: Cælestes vero *Spirituali*, Mystico et *Cœlesti*, quem Rationi et Sensui inscrutabilem *sola Fide* tenemus; qua Verba promissionis, et Rem ipsam promissam, videlicet Christum Crucifixum cum omnibus suis beneficiis, apprehendimus . . . . Nec ullam Inclusionem, Inexistentiam, Coexistentiam, aut localem et *Corporalem* Præsentiam, aut talem Elementorum cum Christi Corpore unionem, per quam illud Oraliter tam ab indignis et *impiis*, quam a fidelibus, *manducetur*. . . .

Etsi quoque Adorationem Christi (quam cæteroqui in Actione Sacræ Cœnæ vel maxime necessariam esse ultro fatemur) non ad ipsa elementa; aut corpus aliquod invisibile sub iis latens, sed ad Christum ipsum ad dextram Patris gloriose regnantem, dirigimus: Nequaquam tamen statuimus nuda, vacua, inania Signa, sed potius id quod significant, et obsignant, simul exhibentia, tanquam certissima media, et *efficacia Instrumenta*, per quæ Corpus et Sanguis Christi adeoque Christus ipse, cum omnibus suis beneficiis singulis vescentibus exhibetur seu offertur, *credentibus* vero *donatur*, et ab ipsis in cibum animæ salutarem et vivificum *acceptatur*." (*Declaratio Thoruniensis;* in Niemeyer's *Collectio* Confessionum, pp. 681, 682.)

* A claim, indeed, has been made for an "Objective" sound in the words "given, taken, and eaten." I am supposing, however, that the readers of this Paper, have already read Paper No. VI., and have been satisfied with the arguments adduced in pp. 391—397, that the true and natural interpretation of the words can yield no support to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. See also note D. in Appendix, pp. 722, sqq.

† As regards Art. 29th, Archdeacon Denison says, "I do not wish to speak of Article XXXIX. as though it presented no difficulty.

nant to their own distinct declarations of what they hold as "*de fide*." The natural and obvious sense which* they bear is too distinctly a repudiation of what is as the very essence of their teaching.

Clearly (I think) those who stand—with our Reformers—in a position of strong and decided opposition to the Corporal Presence, have in these Articles a stronghold all their own. The fortress is entirely in their possession. What they have to do is to defend alone and not to attack. The

Upon the face of it, it *does*, doubtless, present a difficulty, and no man can be surprised that it should be commonly quoted, instanced, and appealed to, as *proving* that what is set out in my Proposition, 'is not the doctrine of the Church of England.'" (Three Sermons, p. 80.)

* How forced and unnatural the other interpretation is, must surely appear clearly to unprejudiced minds from the following words of Archdeacon Denison, "Thus it appears from Articles xxv., xxviii., xxix., taken in connexion, that there are:—1. Those who both *receive* and *partake* of the body and blood of Christ. 2. THOSE WHO RECEIVE, BUT DO NOT PARTAKE OF, THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST."

Dean Goode observes "Unfortunately for the Archdeacon, beyond the difficulty which arises from *the words themselves*, it so happens, (as he himself is obliged to confess) that in the Communion Service 'the words *partake*, *partakers*, are used in contexts which *do not restrict* their use to those worthily receiving, but extend it to those unworthily receiving.'" (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 655.)

As to the natural sense of Article xxix. shortly after the period of its adoption, further evidence may be adduced from the connexion in which it is placed in the Articles of the Irish Church, 1615. (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 665.)

As to the natural sense of the Article both at that and subsequent periods further evidence may be gathered from the interpretation given by ALL the Commentators for two centuries succeeding their final settlement in 1571. (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 665, sqq.)

tactics of their opponents are necessarily confined to attempts to scale or make breaches in the strong wall of exclusion, by endeavouring to show that the Articles cannot mean to say plainly, what they obviously seem to say so very distinctly.

I have in this Paper to fulfil, what I cannot but regard as a sacred duty in the cause of the Truth, which I am persuaded our Reformers have by these Articles delivered and left us to maintain, as Trustees of that, which they counted not their lives dear unto them, that they might bequeath it as a heritage to their children.* And, in endeavouring to fulfil this duty, as in God's sight, and in defence of His Truth, it will be only necessary for me to show that these attempts to take away from the distinctness of our Church's utterances in these Articles, are found upon examination, unable to make one fissure in our walls, and must therefore only tend to make our position more strong, and manifest the weakness of our opponents' weapons.

The assaults will be found to be hottest around Article the twenty-ninth. And in repelling them I shall have to meet objections, which may be put in the form of an endeavour to maintain—

I. That however in ordinary language this Article may seem opposed to the Real Objective Presence, yet in correct theological language it may be otherwise.

* "Let all the harmony of Protestant confessions be consulted, and see if we are not of the harmony, and our Articles do not conspire with theirs; if ours are not as express and as directly opposite to the Roman Church; if there can be any hopes of reconciling us, sooner than of reconciling them." (Bishop George Hooper, of Bath and Wells. Works, vol. i., p. 4. Edit. Oxford, 1855.)

II. That this exclusion of the natural by the theological sense of the words is supported by the known opinions of (1) of Archbishop Parker, (2) of Bishops Cheney and Geste and (3) of St. Augustine.

These allegations I will proceed, therefore, to deal with in their order.

But first, it may be well to repel any preconception which may have arisen from the use of the phrase "effectual signs" in a previous article, as if these words carried with them a Real Objective character, which must needs set something like a Romish or Lutheran impress on our Church's teaching concerning the Eucharist.

To remove any such misconception,* it will suffice to point to the language of some few of our Reformers, that by their use of the like phrase—along with the rejection of the Lutheran Real Presence—it may be clear that the phrase in our Reformation language bears no such character and can stamp no such impress.

The following quotation from Archbishop Whitgift will be found direct to the purpose. "You know very well that we teach far otherwise, and that it is a certain and true doctrine of all such as profess the gospel, that the outward signs of the sacrament do not contain in them grace, neither yet that the grace of God is of necessity tied unto them, but

* Dr. Pusey says "The framers of our Articles, while using the words of this Article [*i.e.* the Article quoted by the Zuinglians as confirming their opinion], in the hope of winning the foreign Protestants, supplied what was lacking in these words, 'Sacraments—be certain sure witnesses and *effectual* (*efficacia*) signs of *grace* and God's good will towards us, by the which *He doth work invisibly in us.*'" (See "The Real Presence from the Fathers," p. 38, note. See also Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 365.)

only that they be seals of God's promises, notes of Christianity, testimonies and EFFECTUAL *signs* of the grace of God, and of our redemption in Christ Jesus, by the which the Spirit of God doth invisibly work in us, not only the increase of faith, but confirmation also." (Works, iii., p. 382.)

And the following from Archbishop Sandys equally so; "A natural body doth not occupy sundry places at once. Here we have a sacrament, a SIGN, a memorial, a commemoration, a representation, a *figure* EFFECTUAL of the body and blood of Christ." (Sermons, p. 88.)

So also again, "As the graces of God purchased for us by Christ are offered unto us by the word, so are they also most lively and *effectually* by the sacraments."* (Ibid, p. 302.)

In the use of such language, indeed, our Reformers were but speaking as Bullinger also spoke.† See Decades, v. 314, where he is vindicating his doctrine of the sacraments against those who would make him say that they "differ nothing from profane SIGNS." And his words are, "They are EFFECTUAL, and not without force." And again he says (p. 321) "Sacraments have a greater and more EFFECTUAL *force* than any sealed charters can have."

Clearly therefore, there is nothing in these words but what properly belonged to the language of those who most emphatically denied the Corporal Presence.

We may, therefore, proceed at once to deal with the first allegation which is brought against our claim to the twenty-ninth Article as altogether our own—

* See Appendix, Note A. as to the sense of this word "effectual."

† Calvin also taught "vere et *efficaciter* exhiberi, non autem naturaliter." (Quoted in Waterland, vol. iv., p. 600.) Jeremy Taylor speaks of the elements as "the EFFICACIOUS SIGNS." (Real Presence, Sect. iii. 9, vol. vi., p. 32.)

I. That however in ordinary language its declaration ıay seem opposed to the doctrine of the Real Objective resence, yet in correct theological language it may be quite herwise.

There are many, I think, who, having been brought under ıe influence of Modern Teachers, are led to range themlves on the side of the Real Objective Presence, and to do under the persuasion that they are only defending our hurch's true teaching. And if to any one such, I were to oint out the force of this Article, and its distinct bearing n the subject, its denial that in the Lord's Supper such as e void of a lively faith are any ways partakers of Christ, nd therein its denial of that which is regarded as such a st of true doctrine by our opponents; then I should expect, ıat such a one would tell me at once, that I was misaprehending the very point of the Article, that in the theoloical language in which it is written, the phrase "partakers f Christ" is equivalent to "partakers of the benefits of hrist's Presence and reception in the Sacrament," that in uch language there is no denial of the real receiving of hrist's body and blood under the form of bread and wine n the Eucharist, but only a teaching that such reception annot be beneficial without faith.

And if I should ask such a one for any evidence of the se of such theological language running so counter to what ıay be called the ordinary and natural use of language in his matter, I should expect him readily to turn to three or our books on his table, and show me one passage after nother, taken from his favourite authors in which this ense is *very clearly* marked upon these words *indeed*, being n almost if not quite every case, set down immediately fterwards or included in an explanatory parenthesis. But o all these passages thus set before me I have one great

objection to make, that they all come from the writings o those who, to maintain their position, are *bound* to make their language tally with the language of the Article, and that, how little *that* naturally tallies with their own language and their own views, is manifest by these passages being so constantly followed by this explanatory parenthesis. I wish to speak no hard words when I say, that such theological language cannot but fall under the suspicion of being language made on purpose.

I must ask to have examples of this strange use of theological language of a somewhat less recent date.* I ASK TO SEE ONE EXAMPLE OF ITS USE IN THE WRITINGS OF THE REFORMERS.

* Dean Comber indeed has said—"There must be a change in us, or else though Christ's natural flesh and blood were here, and we should eat and drink thereof every day, we could *not partake of* Christ." (Companion to Temple. Edit. Oxford, 1841, vol. iii., pp. 247, 248.) But then it must be observed that this is very different indeed from saying we should "IN NO WISE be *partakers of Christ.*" And the sense in which it is said "we could not partake" is made very obvious by the context. The words following are "It is our eating with faith and penitence, love and holy purposes, that *makes it to be* Christ's body and blood to us." Comber died 1699.

Falling short as it does of the requirements of the case (to justify the position of the Ritualists), Comber's language is, I think, *very unusual* and *exceptional*. But much earlier examples are what are asked for, and these spoken as "when *the* VERY *truth* cometh in discussion. See below, p. 612.

Dean Jackson says, "Christ might be *locally* present . . . and yet *not really* present." (See above, p. 425.) But certainly he could not have said that thus He would be *in* NO WISE *present.*

One side of a truth may be forcibly expressed by such paradoxes: and the use and application made of them may sufficiently guard them from misapprehension. But they are obviously out of place when *the* VERY *truth* of any matter is in question: and nothing could justify their insertion in an Article of Religion.

I say that if the allegation is to be made good, it can ıly be made good by evidence brought from examples mewhere near the date of the composition of our Articles. give the whole period from the commencement of the eformation to the end of the reign of Elizabeth, and I k of those who maintain this use of theological language our Article, to produce within that period SOME ONE XAMPLE TO ESTABLISH THEIR POSITION.

Till such examples are produced, I am quite sure it must pronounced nothing more than reasonable, if we decline take the evidence produced from modern English writers riting in defence of "The Real Objective Presence", and aiming it as the teaching of the English Church. We ıall see as we proceed, how utterly this language is unlike ıe language of the English Reformation.

For, we observe, that though not concerned as Modern uthors are to make their language agree with the teaching our Article, yet the Romanists at the time of the Re-rmation were of necessity concerned to make their own nguage agree with that language of Scripture (and the athers,) on which the teaching of our Article rests as on a ıre foundation:* and hence, when driven by disputation

* I think Dr. Pusey's argument (in "Real Presence the Doctrine the English Church," pp. 251—256) would not unfairly be gathered in such words as these—"The article is clearly denying reception the wicked in the same sense as reception is spoken of in Scrip-re, and especially in John vi. But in John vi. and other Scriptures hat is spoken of is clearly *fruitful* eating and partaking." No doubt. ıt do the words in John vi. ever speak of *more than one* sort of ception? Is there anything to imply the *possibility* of *unfruitful* ception? Nay. Is there not there that which excludes the possi-lity of unfruitful reception? Whatever answer to the last Question r. Pusey might give, Dr. Pusey, I am sure, will acknowledge that ır Reformers (including Ridley,—see above, No. 2, p. 58, note)

with our Reformers to make their language agree with th language of Scripture and the Fathers, they resorted exactly the same expedients as those of our Modern Ritua ists, *i.e.* they endeavoured to escape from the difficulty their position as maintaining a doctrine which necessaril involved the reception by the wicked—when pressed wit such sayings as teach that they who eat Christ live by Hi —they endeavoured, I say, to escape from this difficult by maintaining just the distinction which our Moder Teachers maintain, between a *Real* receiving and an *effe*

would have answered without a doubt "Yes. Unfruitful receptio is excluded. For Christ speaks ONLY of one sort of reception. An it is that sort of reception *only* whereby the receiver has everlastin life. The *reception* which our Saviour speaks of IS *beneficial.* I His teaching 'TO EAT' is 'TO LIVE.'" Take, by way of example, th following . . . . "What need we any other witness, when Chris Himself doth testify the matter so plainly, that whosoever eatet His flesh and drinketh His blood hath everlasting life; and that t eat His flesh and to drink His blood is to believe in Him, and who soever believeth in Him hath everlasting life? Whereof it followetl necessarily, that ungodly persons, (being limbs of the Devil,) do no eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood, except the Papists would sa that such have everlasting life." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p 207.) "Throughout the Scriptures this word 'unworthily' is neve joined with Christ's body, never with His blood, for THEY d SANCTIFY their RECEIVERS." (Hutchinson's Works, p. 264. Se p. 265; see also Bradford, Sermons, etc., p. 91, and Bilson a quoted above, p. 110.)

And is not this same answer, in fact, contained in the words o our Article? I do not think Dr. Pusey will maintain that there i any eating "after a heavenly and spiritual manner" which is *no fruitful* eating. But our Article teaches unmistakeably that there i no other eating of the *res sacramenti* at all, save "*only* after heavenly and spiritual manner." How can this then be anything less than a denial of their being *any* eating of the body of Christ which can be *unfruitful?*

tual or *beneficial* receiving. And was the distinction allowed by our Reformers?

Nay. I should not do very wrong if I were to say it was laughed by them to scorn, it was tossed by them to the winds. When Harpsfield thus in conference with Bradford would maintain that the wicked do receive the VERY BODY of Christ, but not the GRACE of His body, Bradford's reply is "No. They receive NOT *the body:* for Christ's body is no dead carcass: he that receiveth it receiveth the Spirit, which is not without grace, I ween." (Sermons, etc., p. 512.)

When Harding thus in controversy with Jewel, makes a

Dr. Waterland has well said "The propositions [in John vi.] are *universal affirmatives.* . . . The sum is: ALL that feed upon what is here mentioned have life; and ALL that do not feed thereupon have no life." (Vol. iv., p. 536.)

And so Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "The sacraments indeed and symbols, the exterior part and ministries may be taken unto condemnation, but THE FOOD ITSELF never." (Vol. viii., p. 17.)

So Barrow, "Whereas our Lord saith, that *whoso eateth His flesh and drinketh His blood hath eternal life*, and CONSEQUENTLY supposeth, that *bad men* DO NOT PARTAKE OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD; yet they [the Papists, Trid. Conc: Sess. 13, cap. 8] condemn this assertion under a curse." (Of the Pope's Supremacy. Works, 1683. Vol. i., Part 2, p. 285.)

So Beveridge, "Truly we need not go far to prove this, even that wicked men do not eat the body and blood of Christ; for if they eat the body and blood of Christ they are not wicked men, but such as dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in them; as Christ Himself assures us, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.* John vi. 26. (On Articles. Edit. Oxford, p. 492.)

Bellarmine has no way of reconciling our Saviour's words with the doctrine of Rome but by saying "Respondeo, verba Domini intelligi cum conditione, si rite manducetur." (De Eucharistiâ, Lib.

real receiving one thing and effectual receiving another, Jewel has no other answer than this, that this is a very *real and effectual* folly.*

Again when Campion the Jesuit would make the same distinction, saying "The wicked eat not Christ effectually and worthily, according to invisible grace," thus he is answered by Goade, "You answer not mine argument out of Augustine; and as for your words and distinction, it is too absurd to separate the eating of Christ Himself from effectual or worthy eating, seeing that whosoever eateth Christ the substance of the sacrament doth live for ever, and so consequently must needs eat Him effectually." (See "A true report of the disputation, etc., with Edwd. Campion, 1581." London, 1583. Third day's Conference. Argument 10.)

Thus, Gardiner, pressed by Cranmer with a saying of St. Augustine, seeks to evade its force by saying "that is not *worthily and well* done, may (because the principal intent faileth) be called *not* done," putting this gloss on St. Augustine's words "not because the body of Christ is not received, which by St. Augustine's mind evil men do to their condemnation, but because the effect of life faileth," (in Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 26). But what has Cranmer to reply to this shift?

Truly he has a reply, which shivers not only Gardiner's

i., cap. vii. See also Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., p. 517.) But what can be more absolute and unconditional than these sayings of our Lord?

* "The distinction . . . is nothing else but a very 'effectual and 'real' folly. For the very body of Christ, if it be not effectually received, is not received. Christ Himself saith, 'He that eateth me shall live by Me.'" (Defence of Apology. P. S. Edit., p. 895.)

evasion, but with it all the arguments by which the force of our Article is now sought to be evaded. Cranmer's words in reply are these—"Thus allege I St. Augustine truly, without adding anything of mine own head, or taking anything away. And what sleight I used is easy to judge: for I cite directly the places, that every man may see whether I say true or no. And if it be not true, quarrel not with me, but with St. Augustine, whose words I only rehearse. And that which St. Augustine saith, spake before him St. Cyprian, and Christ Himself also plainly enough; upon whose words I thought I might be as bold to build a true doctrine for the setting forth of God's glory, as you may be to pervert both the words of Cyprian, and of Christ Himself, to stablish a false doctrine to the high dishonour of God, and the corruption of His most true word. *For you add this word* 'worthily,' *whereby you gather such an unworthy meaning* of St. Augustine's words as you list yourself. And the same you do to the very words of Christ Himself, who speaketh *absolutely and plainly, without adding any such word as you put thereto.* What sophistry this is, you know well enough. Now if this be permitted unto you, to add what you list, and to expound how you list, then you may say what you list without controlment of any man, which it seemeth you look for." (On Lord's Supper, pp. 26, 27.)

But most noteworthy are the words of Cranmer, when again Gardiner would escape from the cogency of his arguments by the same sort of evasion. "Whereas," he says, "I have fully proved as well by authority of Scripture as by the testimony of many old writers, that although evil men eat the sacramental bread and drink the wine, which have the names of His flesh and blood, yet they eat not Christ's very flesh nor drink His blood; your short and

whole answer is this, that evil men may be said *not to eat* Christ's flesh and drink His blood, because they do it *not fruitfully*, as they ought to do; 'and that *may be called* A NOT EATING, as they may be said not to hear God's word, that hear it not profitably; and a thing not well done, may be in speech called not done, in the respect of the good effect.' I grant such speeches be sometime used, but very rarely; and *when the* VERY TRUTH *cometh in discussion*, then *such* PARADOXES ARE NOT TO BE USED. As if it came in question whether a house be builded, that is not well builded, then the definition of the matter must not be, that it is not builded, although the carpenters and other workmen have failed in their covenant and bargain, and not builded the house in such sort as they ought to have done. So our Saviour Christ teacheth that all heard the word, whether the seed fell in the highway, or upon the stones, or among the thorns, or in the good ground. Wherefore when this matter cometh in discussion among the old writers, whether evil men eat Christ's body or no, if the truth had been that evil men eat it, the old writers would not so precisely have defined the contrary, that they eat not, but would have said, they eat it, but not effectually, not fruitfully, not profitably. But now the authors which I have alleged, define plainly and absolutely, that evil men eat not Christ's body, without any other addition. But after this sort that you do use, it shall be an easy matter for every man to say what liketh him, and to defend it well enough, if he may add to the Scriptures and doctors' words at his pleasure, and make the sense after his own phantasy. The Scriptures and doctors which I allege do say in plain words, as I do say, that evil men do not eat the body of Christ, nor drink His blood, but only they that have life thereby. Now

come you in with your addition and gloss, made of your own head, putting thereto this word 'effectually.' If I should say that Christ was never conceived nor born, could not I avoid all the Scriptures that you can bring to the contrary, by adding this word 'apparently,' and defend my saying stoutly? . . . . And what heresy can be reproved, if the heretics may have that liberty that you do use, to add of their own heads to the words of Scripture? . . . Moreover, the authorities, which I have brought to approve my doctrine, do clearly cast away your addition, adding the cause why evil men cannot eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 215.)

Now, let us just look round, at the actual state and position of things—the Reformers well acquainted with just the same distinctions as those of the Ritualists—the Reformers rejecting them utterly, as advanced by Romish antagonists—the Reformers also maintaining as one man the doctrine which is contained in the words of the Article as naturally and obviously understood—the Reformers too quite capable of expressing themselves clearly in this matter, and language being very capable of being made to express the distinction maintained; and let us ask, Is it likely, is it possible, that in framing this Article they have adopted a distinction they repudiated to make way for a doctrine they contended against most earnestly, and have expressed themselves in language most unlikely to convey the meaning they meant, when words were at hand which might readily have conveyed that meaning unmistakeably?

For what—we may ask, on such an extraordinary hypothesis as that of their wishing to say in this Article what Ritualists wish to make its true meaning—What was there to hinder their speaking out clearly? If they meant the word "partakers" to signify a beneficial or effectual recep-

tion, What hindered their inserting the word "*beneficially*" or "*effectually*"? What hindered their framing the remainder of the Article so as to express what they meant clearly, instead of hiding it under words, which could only naturally express what they did *not* mean? What conceivable purpose can they be supposed to have had for running such a risk of letting their true sense suffer shipwreck, when one word so easily might have been taken in to avoid it?

Nay, more. Our Reformers did not only *not* take in such a word, but there is evidence that they really did of set purpose omit such a word, for in the passage alluded to in St. Augustine, there was a word ("spiritually") standing there (probably by interpolation, but *still standing*) and sometimes retained in the writings of Reformers when quoting the same passage. And this word might not only have suggested the insertion of some other such word, but if it had itself been retained it might possibly have helped somewhat to make some room for such an unnatural meaning as it contended for. But what did the compilers of our Articles do? Not only they failed to make any such insertion, but they so paraphrased the earlier words of St. Augustine's sentence as to *exclude* that *very* interpolated *word* which might have seemed to modify his meaning.*

Yet further. The Article has not only rejected the word "*spiritually*," which might possibly have left room for a partaking *some other wise;* but it has adopted the word "*nowise*," which can hardly be anything else than a closing the door (in the case of the faithless) against *oral reception* as well as *spiritual reception*, and a denial of partaking *unfruitful-wise* and *ineffectual-wise* quite as much as of partaking *fruitful-wise* and *effectual-wise*.

* See Appendix, Note B.

But we must add to this, that the subject of this Article was felt very much at the time of the Reformation, as it is felt now, to be a most important part of the controversy, and a test of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence.*

The Question, "Do the wicked and faithless receive the body and blood of Christ?" separated Christians so called into two classes. On one side of that Question were Romanists and Lutherans, and they both answered "Yes." On the other side were those named "Reformed," and these answered "No." Archdeacon Denison was not the first to apply this unfailing test. Ask concerning the "Real Presence" and all might in one sense or other accept the term. Ask concerning the manner of the Reception, whether it be a heavenly and spiritual manner apprehended by faith; and the Reformed would very gladly and heartily say "Yes." But (however unnaturally) in some sense, Lutherans would say the same.† But ask concerning what unbelievers receive in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and then as now, it was felt that the question was a testing question, which must send you to one side or the other. And here we have an Article which deals with this very testing question. Every one would look to this Article for its "Yes" or its "No" to the question. Strange if its answer in natural language should be "No;" but when looked at through this strange theological language we should find it turned to "Yes"! Strange indeed, if on such a point theological language should be incapable of speaking expressly its "Yea," except through words which to common ears sound plain "Nay"!

And it may not be argued that the Article did not mean

* See Appendix, Note C.

† Yet with a denial of the "only" of our Article. See below, pp. 670, 720.

to have anything to do with this testing question, that it meant to leave it quite on one side, to let it rest an open question, not, in fact to say anything to that subject at all. For even if the body of the Article could thus be explained, yet the heading of the Article must be allowed to indicate the subject of the Article, must be conceded to point to that which the Article is intended to speak to. And the heading of the Article sets forth the subject of the Article as this very testing subject. Nay more, much more, it tells not only the question it intends to answer, but it tells us the answer it means to give, for the heading is, "Of the wicked which eat not the body and blood of Christ."

But it will be said, "The heading is no part of the Article, and in subscribing the Articles we are not required to subscribe to the headings. You have therefore no right to take the meaning out of the heading and impart that meaning into the Article."*

* "They [our opponents] even go so far as to cast the words in our teeth and say that we could only sign the Article with a good conscience if the 'not' were omitted. TO THIS OF COURSE WE REPLY, that with the TITLE of the Article we have *nothing whatever to do*, we are called upon to SIGN the *Article* alone and NOT *the* TITLE *with it*. Of course, if the title be a true representation of the contents of the Article, then in signing the Article we do practically sign the title as well. But if the title contain something over and above what the Article itself declares, then it is *no concern of ours*: for otherwise we might be called upon practically *to sign seventy-eight Articles instead of thirty-nine*. The *title* therefore is neither *here nor there* in the matter, and must be left *entirely out of the question*." (Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 412.) Subsequently the unnatural explanation of the Article is forced also into the title—"To 'partake of Christ' is not merely to receive Him, but *so* to receive Him as to become an actual sharer in His nature, by the assimilation of His substance into our own. *In this sense therefore must the*

Perhaps not. But I am sure I *have* a right, in all common sense, and in all common fairness, to use the sense of that

AMBIGUOUS PHRASE '*eat not*' be taken in the title." (Sequel to "The Kiss of Peace," p. 413.)

To the same effect Dr. Pusey had written, "Nor can the heading of the Article stand *per se,* as a substantive proposition, apart and distinct from the meaning of the body of the Article. For this *would be* to make the *heading* of the Article, a 40*th Article;* which no one would allow to be right. Yet it is PROBABLE that the *heading* and the *Article* have *one and the same meaning.* Since then the meaning, attached *by some* to the heading, cannot be forced into the Article, it is obvious to think, whether the heading and the Article are not to be *brought into harmony;* by taking the *heading* in the only sense of which the Article admits." (Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 254.) So also Bishop Forbes, "Nor can the heading of an Article form a proposition, binding on us, distinct from the meaning of the body of the Article. For this would be to make such heading a 40th Article, which is, of course, inadmissible." (On Articles, vol. ii., p. 590.)

Concerning these quotations I desire to say nothing more than this—We must have a very poor opinion indeed of the framers of our Articles, if we conceive that the Titles, fairly understood, can be really capable of either adding to the meaning of the Articles, or misleading us as to their true sense. But if they are allowed not to be capable of misleading, their interpretative application, when it can be made available, *must* be a reasonable, right, and fair application.

In the case of the Article before us, Is there, I ask, any reasonable room for doubt as to the sense of the body of the Article itself? For myself, I can see none whatever. But of this, every fairly intelligent reader is quite as capable of judging, as the most learned theologian, unless it can be shown that the theology of the day had a language on the subject peculiar to itself. But, supposing that sufficient evidence had been brought forward to make the natural sense of the Article itself to be doubtful, could any one, in fairness, refuse to allow an appeal to the Title, for such help as it might afford towards a resolution of the doubt? I am well content to leave this question in the hands of my readers.

heading, expressing as it does the known views of our Reformers on this testing question, declaring as it does the Article's intention, in accordance with the known views of our Reformers,—of repudiating any answer but one to that testing question,—I am sure (I say) I have a right to use the heading of this Article not to add to the Article's meaning, but to protect the only natural meaning of the Article from being taken from* it, to make room for another sense, which

* The words of the Article were intended, I believe, to express the meaning of the heading, if possible, *more strongly* and *distinctly* rather than more equivocally. Take the following from Cranmer—"As for the ungodly and carnal, they may eat the bread and drink the wine, but with Christ Himself they have no communion or company; and therefore they neither eat His flesh, nor drink His blood." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 203.) Indeed it is not easy to see what language could have been used to speak more distinctly and decidedly than the Article does.

All who eat partake (see 1 Cor. x. 18 with 16,) though not all who partake eat. All eating is partaking. Not all partaking is eating. The words therefore "in no wise partakers" declare concerning the unfaithful eating of the *sign*, not only that it does not include the eating of the *thing signified*, but that it excludes any and every sort of real participation of Christ. The unfaithful can have NO SORT of κοινωνία, NO communion, NO partaking of Christ whatever. How then can they have the κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ? How can they eat His flesh and drink His blood?

Compare the following from Ursinus—"Paulus dicit 1 Cor. x. Nolim vos *participes* dæmoniorum esse: Non potestis *participes* esse mensæ Domini et mensæ dæmoniorum; poculum Domini bibere, et poculum dæmoniorum. Impii autem sunt κοινωνοὶ dæmoniorum, *participes* mensæ dæmoniorum, et bibentes poculum dæmoniorum. Ergo non sunt κοινωνοὶ Christi, neque *participes* mensæ et poculi Domini reipsa, utcunque *participes* sint symbolorum." (Common: Chytræi Consideratio, in Works, vol. ii., p. 1404. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

if it be allowed to come in, can only come in to crush what our Reformers set there as in a sure place, giving us the keys for its safe custody.

Let me further ask this question—Upon what conceivable hypothesis are we to account for the fact that this Article, having received the assent of Convocation in 1562, was not allowed to appear in the printed copies, if this Article was not understood to speak to this moot question, and to decide against the Corporal Presence? If, in the language of the time, it was naturally understood to deny only fruitful reception, the influence brought to bear against it appears unaccountable. What objection could any one have to accept and subscribe the Article in such a sense? On the other hand, understood in what I must call its natural sense, the omission was in entire accordance with the policy pursued in the earlier years of Elizabeth's reign. It would be offensive to many, and offensive in a particular, in which it was felt to be very inexpedient, at that time, to give needless offence. Its offence consisted in its applying so severe a test of doctrine, a test which was felt to exclude, of necessity, the doctrine of a Corporal Presence in the Elements.

Further yet, I must ask the reader, who desires to consider fairly the claims of the new interpretation of this Article, to view it beside the following extract from "The Apology of the Church of England." "We *affirm*, together with the ancient fathers, that the body of Christ is *not eaten* but of the good and faithful, and of those that are endued with the Spirit of Christ. Their *doctrine* is, that Christ's very body effectually [*re ipsa*—Latin] and, as they speak, *really* and *substantially*, may not only be eaten of the *wicked and unfaithful* men, but also (which is monstrous to be

spoken) of mice and dogs."* (P. S. Edit., p. 92.) Now, will any † affirm that in this passage the "Apology" does not, on behalf of the Church of England, deny *simply* the reception of the *res sacramenti* by the unfaithful, and speak of the doctrine which affirms such a reception as one, by the Church of England repudiated?

And shall we then maintain that the Church of England uses one sort of theological language in her "Apology," and (at the same date) quite a different theological language in her Articles?

But we must not only do this, we must also make the Church of England teach *one doctrine* in her Apology, and at the same time, the very *opposite doctrine* in her Articles —if we will maintain that the Article before us does not actually deny all real ["re ipsa"] reception of Christ's body by the unfaithful.

If anything needs to be added, let it be added to all this, that at the date of the framing and first subscribing of this Article, there had been not eight years before, one of our English martyrs, and one not the least honoured, who had been condemned to the stake on the very charge of asserting what this Article in its natural and obvious meaning asserts; and that the very words of Bradford as quoted in his sentence of condemnation correspond almost exactly

* The Latin is as follows: "Nos cum antiquissimis Patribus affirmamus, corpus Christi *non comedi nisi ab hominibus piis et fidelibus, et imbutis Spiritu Christi:* isti docent ipsissimum corpus Christi re ipsa, utque ipsi loquuntur, 'realiter', et 'substantialiter,' non tantum ab impiis et infidelibus, sed etiam, quod horrendum dictu est, a muribus et canibus posse comedi." (Edit. Cantab., 1838, p. 106.)

† Against any such affirmation, there is surely no need to appeal to the support of the "Defence of the Apology," which would remove all doubt, if doubt were possible.

with the words which stand in the title of this Article. The title of our Article is* "Of the wicked which eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper." Bradford's sentence† is the sentence of death because—in the words of that sentence—he said "that an evil man doth not receive it [the body of Christ] *in forma panis*." (See Bradford's Works, ii., p. 585.)

And Bradford declares to Pendleton, "Transubstantiation is the thing whereof I am condemned, and also the denial of wicked men to receive Christ's body." (See Ibid, p. 542.)

And if it be contended that there may be a difference meant between *receiving* Christ's body and *eating* Christ's body or being *partaker* of Christ's body, then let us observe that Bradford again in his farewell to Walden, declares that he is persecuted because, he says, "I cannot, dare not, nor will not confess transubstantiation: and how that wicked men . . . *eating* the sacrament . . . do *eat* Christ's natural and real body." (Ibid, p. 456.)

Is there anything, then it may be asked, lacking to bring out the identity of language?

And shall we suppose that eight years sufficed to make such a wonderful change in the theological language of the time? or shall we think that the history of Bradford had passed all out of mind?

Or shall we think that Bradford's memory abiding, and language remaining unchanged, the framers of our Articles while desiring to express a totally different thing, were

* Originally the Title stood "Impii non manducant corpus Christi in usu cœnæ." The change in the form of the Titles was made at Jewel's last revision in 1571.

† The entire accusation may be seen quoted in Paper No. 2.

unable to find any language to express their meaning, but that which naturally expressed the very thing for which they knew Bradford had been put to death?

Is it conceivable that they chose to use language which naturally understood would place them as on Bradford's side, while, in truth, they were only meaning to express a doctrine which would rather set them on the side of Bradford's condemners?*

Yet to estimate the weight of this evidence at anything like its true value, Bradford's case must not be regarded as standing in an isolated position. No. But it must be viewed in connexion with a fact, a fact of which every attentive reader will have found evidence in the second and third Papers of this series. I mean the fact, that what Bradford denied, and was burnt for denying (the reception of Christ by the wicked), our Reformers were constantly denying, and denying in the same words in which Bradford denied it. Or to say the same thing in other words, our

* "What a new wonder must this be to the world, to hear the Church constituted by Cranmer and Ridley accused of popery! the faith and worship suspected to be unreformed, which was delivered down to us by those great martyrs! Is this the reward of a Church whose sons have given so loud a testimony against the Roman, in their lives and by their deaths; who have still borne the burden and heat of the day, who have felt the fiercest rage of the enemy, and have returned them the deadliest wounds; who have been foremost still in all encounters, all along in the last age and in our own, the famous and victorious champions of the Protestant cause? If this Church, and these men, after the declaration made in our Articles, after repeated subscriptions and abrenunciations, after all this zealous opposition of popery, must be yet suspected of popery; as, well, on the other side, may the decrees of the Council of Trent be said to comply with the Reformation, and the Pope himself be thought a Protestant." (Bishop George Hooper, of Bath and Wells. Works. vol. i., p. 3. Edit. Oxford, 1855.)

Reformers were continually teaching and asserting just that which, in its natural meaning, the 29th Article teaches and asserts (that the wicked do in no wise receive Christ), and asserting and teaching it in just the same sort of language as that in which our Article asserts it and teaches it still.

And did the Framers of the Article, being our Reformers themselves, aim at teaching something in the Article quite different from that which our Reformers always taught; and did they think to teach that other and quite different, yea rather that *repugnant* doctrine, in language which *out of the Article* our Reformers always used to signify that which they *did* believe and *did* always teach, viz., that (in the natural and obvious meaning of the words) the wicked do not eat the body of Christ?

For one very plain example of the use of such language, and of the sense in which it was used, let the reader refer to Rogers's "Exposition of the Articles" published in 1585. It will be found to give most important evidence on this point. Rogers speaks of the Ubiquitaries, "which think the body of Christ so is present in the Supper, as His said body, with bread and wine, by one and the same mouth, at one and the same time, of all and every communicant is *eaten* corporally and *received* into the belly." (Page 289.) And again he speaks of "the Ubiquitaries, both Lutheran and Popish," as "Adversaries to this doctrine" because of their "saying the very body of Christ, at the Lord's Supper, is eaten as well of the wicked as of the godly; these affirming that all communicants, bad and good, do eat the very and natural body of Christ Jesus." (Page 293.)*

Here is unquestionable evidence given as to the theolo-

* The work of Rogers "perused, and by the lawful authority of the Church of England, allowed to be public," has on its title-page (1607) the words "The said Articles analysed into propositions,

gical language of the time, (1) that the words *eat* and *receive* are used convertibly, (2) that *eat* is not used for profitable eating or receiving, (3) that this Article itself was so understood at this date (fourteen years after its authorization) as that all Ubiquitaries, Lutheran as well as Romanists, were regarded (to use Rogers's own words) as "Adversaries unto this doctrine," *i.e.* to the doctrine declared and stated in this very 29th Article, (4) of the testing character of the question of eating and receiving, as then understood.

It will tend further to illustrate the teaching of our Article from the theological language of the period, to refer briefly to the published account of the Conference with Campion the Jesuit, Sept. 23, 1581. The following is an extract. "*Fulke.* . . . Answer to Saint Augustine, which saith, The wicked eat not the body of Christ in very deed. *Campion.* They eat Christ sacramentally. *Fulke.* Yea, but not in deed, as Saint Augustine saith. *Campion.* They re-

and the Propositions proved to be *agreeable* both to the written word of God, and to the *extant Confessions* of *all the neighbour Churches, Christianly* REFORMED."

And of this 29th Article it declares (p. 293) "Of this judgement be other Churches, Christian and reformed besides"; giving references to Confess. Helv., Basil., Bohem., Gal., Belg.; from which the following extracts are given (see note in P. S. Edit.) "Qui nullâ cum fide ad hanc sacram Domini mensam accedit, sacramento duntaxat communicat, et rem sacramenti, unde est vita et salus, nor percipit." (Conf. Helv. Post. cap. xxi.) "It is *spiritual* meat, and therefore it is received of a *faithful* soul." (Conf. Basil, in Hall's Harmony, p. 325.)

"Affirmamus eos, qui ad mensam Domini, *puram fidem*, tanquam *vas quoddam afferunt*, vere recipere quod ibi signa testificantur." (Conf. Gall., Art. 37.) "Prætereaquamvis sacramenta sint conjuncta rei ipsæ significatæ, ambæ tamen res istæ non ab omnibus recipiuntur. Malus enim recipit quidem sacramentum in suam condemnationem, at rem seu veritatem sacramenti non recipit." (Conf. Belg., Art. 35.)

ceive the same Christ, but not to the same comfort that the godly do. *Fulke.* They do not receive Christ, saith Saint Augustine: because they are not to be accounted in the members of Christ. *Campion.* And I say the same. *Fulke.* HE SAITH, THEY EAT NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN DEED: YOU AFFIRM THAT THEY EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN DEED. . . . . *Goade.* I will follow the confutation of that absurd assertion, that the wicked eat the body of Christ, which is easy to be improved many ways, I will frame mine argument thus, Whosoever eateth the body of Christ, doth eat *Rem Sacramenti,* the thing or substance of the Sacrament. But no wicked person can eat *Rem Sacramenti. Ergo,* No wicked person can eat the body of Christ. . . . *Goade.* It is manifest, that Saint Augustine doth make but two parts of the Sacrament, which he doth distinguish, viz., the outward sign which he calleth the Sacrament, and the inward thing or substance of the Sacrament, which is Christ Himself. And out of the same words of Augustine, I follow mine argument thus against your absurd distinction. Whosoever eateth Christ the thing or substance of the Sacrament, shall live for ever. But none of the wicked or unfaithful shall live for ever. *Ergo,* None of the wicked can eat Christ, being the substance of the Sacrament. . . . *Goade.* . . . Consider the words of Augustine, he affirmeth the Sacrament to consist of two things, the visible *sign,* which he calleth *Hujus rei Sacramentum,* and the invisible grace, or Christ Himself, which he calleth *Rem Sacramenti.*" (Third Day's Conference, Arg. 9 and 10.)

Now let the reader be asked to mark here (1) the use of language corresponding to that of our Article (*eating and receiving* being used indiscriminately) to teach a doctrine diametrically opposed to that of the Ritualists, but just that which agrees with the natural and obvious interpretation of

the Article, (2) the appeal—after the manner of the Article—to the teaching of Augustine as clearly supporting this natural sense, (3) the sense attached to "*sign* or *sacrament*," and regarded as the sense of St. Augustine, which is clearly the sense required for the obvious and natural interpretation of the Article, but which will not agree at all with the sense of the Ritualists. Let the reader also observe that the publication from which this extract is made has the authority of Dean Nowell, the author, probably, of our Church Catechism, and certainly of that larger Catechism, which has received the sanction, if not in full of the Convocation of 1562, yet certainly of the Convocation of 1603 in the 79th Canon.

I trust the reader will not think me wearisome, if I adduce yet another example, giving evidence, both as to the theological language of the period, and also as to the fact of our Article dealing with one of the chief moot-questions of the Reformation.

I refer to the dying testimony of Dr. Redmayne, a man whom Strype speaks of as "a Papist,"* and "one of the learnedest men of his time," "a Person of extraordinary reputation among all for his great Learning and Reading, and profound knowledge of Divinity, so that the greatest Divines gave a mighty deference to his judgment." Mr. Soames says that "Dr. Redmayne had been engaged during more than twenty years in theological research. His original

* Strype has been found fault with for using this term. But it is evidently (I think) intended simply to convey the impression that Redmayne had never given in his adherence to the new learning. Standing aloof from the decided action of our Reformers, and pursuing independently his own investigations, his mind (which, so far as it was prejudiced, would have been led by its prejudices in the opposite direction) had been brought, it appears, before his decease, to nearly the same conclusions as those of our Reformers, in *most* (though scarcely yet fully in *all*) the points in dispute.

object in undertaking these laborious enquiries was to confirm himself and others in the religious principles long implicitly admitted by European scholars." But "the result was that he found himself obliged to admit the truth of nearly all the principles which he had reckoned on proving false." He was overtaken by mortal illness in 1551.* "While lingering at ease in mind, and unclouded in apprehension, Bishop Ridley and others who knew his worth, resorted to the dying scholar's couch." Strype says, "Many learned men resorted to him, desiring to know his last judgment on several *points*, then so *much controverted*." To Dr. Alexander Nowell, then master of Westminster school, the dying man gave a somewhat detailed account of the theological opinions, to which his long and learned investigations had led him. We must not enter into these except so far as his words bear upon the question before us. But very important is the following declaration made by this dying man, "Item, That the wicked are *not partakers* of the body of Christ, but receive the *outward sacrament only*."†

Can any one read this and doubt what here is meant by the word "partakers"? Can any one doubt what Dr. Redmayne meant by *the outward sacrament only* received by the wicked?‡

* It may be observed that the words of Redmayne bear witness to the sense of the theological language of our Article about eleven years before its composition; as that of Rogers does about fourteen years after its authorization.

† See Foxe's Acts and Monuments (Seeley's Edit.) vol. vi., p. 269; Strype's Cranmer, book ii., chap. xxvi., pp. 269, 270; Soames's History of Reformation, vol. iii., pp. 633—638; Hardwick's Reformation, p. 225; Downes's Life of Redmayne, prefixed to Sparrow's Rationale. Edit. 1722, pp. 144, 145.

‡ If it were possible to doubt, no doubt would remain after read-

And shall we think that our Article is using language in quite a different sense, and meaning to affirm quite a different thing, when it asserts that the wicked "in no wise are partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing"?

Yet, just once more, let it be added that in King Edward's reign, Peter Martyr had publicly taught at Oxford (where his lectures as Regius Professor had been so highly valued by many of our Reformers), and that with special

ing the following extract from Young's letter: "When he was asked, whether wicked and ungodly people, in the Holy Communion, did *eat* the body of Christ, and drink His blood, he answered, that kind of men *did* NOT *eat* Christ's most blessed flesh, but ONLY TOOK the sacrament to their own damnation; saying, that Christ would not give His most pure and holy flesh to be eaten of such naughty and impure persons, but would withdraw Himself from them. 'And that,' quoth he, 'that is objected by St. Augustine, that Judas received the self same thing which Peter received, that I think to be understood of the *external* sacrament.'" (See Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., p. 272.) Again he said that the wicked "do receive the *sacrament*, and the self same which good and godly men *receive;* but the body of Christ they *do* NOT *receive*, for Christ doth not vouchsafe to deliver it them." (Ibid, pp. 272, 273.)

Let it be specially observed that Dr. Redmayne uses the three expressions (1) to *eat*, (2) to *receive*, (3) *to be partakers of*, all to signify the same thing.

It will be observed that Dr. Redmayne's words are cited here for their bearing on the question of *language*. He made statements clearly (I think) condemnatory of anything like the Real Objective Presence. His mind, however, seems to have been not fully settled in—though certainly inclined to—the persuasion, that reception is after a *spiritual manner* ONLY. (See Foxe, p. 268. But see also pp. 267, 270, 273.)

T. Lever, who received his information from Young himself, says that Dr. Redmayne "added, moreover, that it was an excellent book which the most reverend Archbishop of Canterbury had lately written upon the Eucharist, and he recommended Young to read it with much attention." (See Orig. Letters, P.S. Edit. i., p. 152.)

reference to the Lutheran doctrine—"Quicquid impii ibi comedant corporaliter, non debent dici comedere Corpus Christi, nisi signo aut symbolo velis tribuere nomen rei."*

Will any one maintain that Peter Martyr was not in these words denying all real reception by the wicked? Will any one look at our Article as set beside the words of Peter Martyr, and maintain that it is dealing with an altogether different question, and teaching an altogether different doctrine?

But enough of this, I proceed to reply to—

II. The second allegation, viz., that this non-natural sense of the Article is supported by the known opinions (1) of Archbishop Parker, (2) of Bishops Chency and Geste, and (3) of St. Augustine.

(1) Archbishop Parker is rightly claimed as the writer of this Article. And though the true meaning of the Article is the sense in which it was authorized, which might possibly not be the meaning of the framer; yet let it freely be granted, that the force of our arguments in favour of the natural and obvious meaning of the Article, will be broken up, if it can be shewn that Parker's opinions were certainly or even probably the opinions on this subject of those who hold the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

Certainly, till this is shewn, what has been stated presents a most weighty presumption against Parker's holding such

* See Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1626 b, Basle, 1580. Compare the following: "Impii accedentes, panem quidem et vinum sumunt, nihil autem fructus habent, sed ad exitium manducant et bibunt: pii vero ac fideles, non simplicia et nuda signa usurpant, sed unà corporis et sanguinis Christi credendo fiunt participes." (Peter Martyr, Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 734 b. Basle, 1580.)

views. But if it can be shown indeed, that, in spite of all the presumption against it, Parker *did* hold them, then it must be confessed our arguments will be pretty much brought to nought.

But did Parker hold these views? Trace this opinion concerning Parker to its source, and it will be found—that like many a large river rising from a small fountain—it has its original (I think) in nothing more than the ill-name of "a great Papist"* which some Puritan zealots desired to fasten upon him. But then Whitgift too was called by harder names still, and Whitgift as we have seen, in terms renounced "the Real Presence." Nay more; we have seen that Parker too by his approval of Whitgift's book and his own declaration of the oneness of our Church's doctrine stands committed also to a denial of "the Real Presence" on behalf of the English Church.

* For *what* this name was given to Parker may appear from his words following. "Does your Lordship thinke, that I care either for cap, tippet, surplis, or wafer-breade, or any such? But for the lawes so established, I esteme them, and not more for exercise of contempt against lawe and authoritie, which I se wil be the end of it: nor for any other respect. If I, you, or any other, named grea Papistes, should so favour the Pope, or his religion, that we should pinch Christ's true Gospel, woe be unto us all." These words are from Parker's last letter to the Lord's Treasurer, quoted from Strype by Soames (Elizabethan History, p. 19), who says, "For enforcing these ancient formalities, he, and others in authority, had been stigmatised as *Great Papists*. He repels the appellation as calumnious, admitting an awful responsibility were it otherwise."

Whitgift also with all his distinctness against "the Real Presence" was called by Barrowe "a monster, a persecutor, a compound of he knew not what, neither ecclesiastical nor civil, like the second beast spoken of in the Revelations." (See Neal's History of Puritans, i., p. 354.)

And it is not difficult to account for Parker's being called a great Papist* without his being a Lutheran. Nay: a strong argument might be built on this name against it. For he was called so, because, in his zeal for conformity, he was strong in insisting on the vestments (*i.e.* the surplice, tippet, etc.,) and the vestments† by the Puritans were counted

* Neal writes deliberately of Queen Elizabeth as "*more inclined to*" *Popery* than Puritanism, while in the very same sentence declaring that "she *approved* of the DOCTRINES of the *foreign reformed* Churches, but thought they had stripped religion too much of its *ornaments*." (History of Puritans, vol. i., p. 383.)

† The reader must not fail to observe that there is a very wide difference indeed between the "*vestments*" which were in controversy in Elizabeth's reign, and the "*vestments*" which are in controversy now. Bullinger's opinion of the one and the other may be seen in the words following: "And to repeat my sentiments in a few words, I could never approve of your officiating, if so commanded, at an altar laden rather than adorned with the image of Him that was crucified, and in the appropriate dress of the mass, that is in the albe and cope, on the back part of which also the same image is represented. But as far as I can understand by a letter from England there is no dispute concerning the habits of this kind, but the question is whether it be lawful for the ministers of the Gospel to wear a round or square cap, and a white garment which they call a surplice, by the wearing of which the minister may be distinguished from the people." (Bullinger quoted in Blakeney's Book of Common Prayer, pp. 299, 300.)

"Mr. Marriott gives in illustration a number of drawings and photographs from the Early Christian cemetries. The briefest glance at them will convince the reader of two things; first, that anything like the present vestments of the Romish celebrant were absolutely unknown for four or five centuries at least; and secondly, that the actual vestments of that period more resembled the flowing surplice and stole of an English clergyman than anything else. . . . It is no less clear from the remarks respecting the use of colour we find in the earliest Fathers, notably in Clemens Alexandrinus, that

"Papistical." And it shows how ready the Puritans were to find matter for strong language, and to bring accusations for trifles. Should we not then certainly have heard of it,

they would have regarded the use of bright colours as most unsuitable because meretricious. The copies of wall paintings in the ancient catacombs appear to place it beyond the reach of doubt that the vestments in which the earliest Christians ministered were white." (Saddler in the Church and the Age, p. 311.) For further evidence as to white vestments, see L'Aroque, History of Eucharist, p. 539, Walker's translation, 1684. See also Hooker, vol. ii., p. 130. Edit. Keble.

"We have the fullest evidence that vestments of brilliant colours were regarded by Christians [in the earlier ages] as heathenish, unmanly and meretricious, fit only for the stage, or for the rites of Pagan superstition, in which they were worn by the sacrificing priests. On the other hand, white raiment satisfied all their wants of appropriate symbolism, and appeared to them most truly beautiful. The thing which would probably have amazed them most of all would have been to hear that the ornaments which in their minds were associated with all that was most profane, effeminate and impure, were the best fitted for the celebration of their holiest mysteries. . . . We may also infer with great confidence from all we know, that the need or propriety of a peculiar vestment for solemnizing the Lord's Supper—which is now insisted on almost as an axiom—never entered the minds of those early Christians; though, if it had, the vestments adopted by the Ritualists after the Romish fashion, are the last they would have chosen for the purpose." (Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1869, pp. 52, 53. See Bellarmine De Missâ, lib. ii., cap. xiv., pp. 1097, 1098. See also S. C. Malan on Ritualism, pp. 28—32, 112.)

In our second Book of Homilies it is said, "You see how St. Jerome teacheth the sumptuousness of the Jews to be a figure to signify, and not an example to follow, and that those outward things were suffered for a time until Christ our Lord came." (Page 229. Third part of Sermon against Peril of Idolatry.) And this follows a quotation from St. Jerome, in which it is said, "Neither let any

if they could have laid to Parker's charge any such false doctrine? Yet what Puritan ever charged him with teaching the Corporal Presence?

It might* be curious to trace the steps by which this

man object and allege against me the rich temple that was in Jewry, the table, candlesticks, incense, ships, platters, cups, mortars, and other things all of gold. Then were these things allowed of the Lord, when the priests offered sacrifices, and the blood of beasts was accounted the redemption of sins." Again the Homily says (pp. 230, 231) "Zephyrinus, the sixteenth bishop of Rome, made a decree, that they should use vessels of glass. Likewise were the *vestures* used in the Church in old time very plain and single, and nothing costly. And Rabanus at large declareth, that this costly and manifold furniture of vestments of late used in the Church was fet from the Jewish usage, and agreeth with Aaron's appalling almost altogether." (See on this subject a Pamphlet—"The Rubric as to the Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof." Parker, Oxford.)

"Olim sacrificium ab Apostolis et viris apostolicis in primitiva Ecclesia vasis ligneis, et vulgaribus vestibus celebrabatur." (Beleth in Durandus, Rational. Div. Offic., p. 778a. Naples, 1859.)

* The Romanist Dorman classes together Parker, Geste, and Cheney as men worthy to bear the office of true bishops in Christ's Church, and speaks of Parker as a Lutheran in respect to the Eucharist. Dorman is quoted apparently with approval by Hardwick (History of the Reformation, p. 246) who also himself speaks of Geste as a scholar "of like mind" with Parker; though, it should be added, that in his work on the Articles (p. 138) he speaks of Dorman's statements as probably exaggerated. This appears to have led Dr. Pusey into the error of classing Parker with Geste and Cheney, which Dean Goode declares to be "an assertion without the slightest foundation . . . a mere polemical device, for which there is not the slightest ground." (On Eucharist, Supplem., p. 26.) Dr. Pusey's words are, "We know that there were then, as now, two parties in the Church, of the one of which Archbishop Parker himself, Bishop Geste, and Bishop Cheney were representatives . . .

doctrine has been brought and laid at Parker's door. The "*Papistical*" name seems to have suggested an identification with those included in the phrase * "Lutherano Papis-

of those two parties, Archbishop Parker, who wrote with his own hand the most important changes in the Articles of the Sacrament, belonged to that, which, from its belief as to the Sacraments, was called Lutheran." (Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church, pp. 186-7.) Perhaps led by Dr. Pusey's error we find Mr. Grueber asserting that "it is well known Parker was very favourable" to the Lutherans. (Reply to Dr. Heurtley, p. 42, note.) It is to the credit of Lingard, that he does not, I think, make any attempt to convey this misconception.

It is fair, too, to Mr. Perry to observe, that he only claims for Parker that "his views on this Doctrinal question" were certainly "*not lower* than Grindal's." (On Declaration concerning Kneeling, p. 68.) I should be sorry not to concede even more than this very willingly.

* Heylin speaks of "the whole number" of those clergy who did not conform on Elizabeth's accession as "not amounting to 200 men, which in a realm consisting of 9,000 parishes, and twenty-six Cathedral Churches, could be no great matter." "But then," he adds, "we are to know withal that many who were cordially affected to the interests of the Church of Rome dispensed with themselves in these outward conformities, which some of them are said to do upon a hope of seeing the like revolution by the death of the Queen as had before happened by the death of King Edward." (History of Reformation. E. H. S. Edit., vol. ii., pp. 295, 296.) After reading this none will think it needful to apply the term "Lutherano-papistical ministry" to such as Archbishop Parker. The letter of Grindal and Horn will be found in Zurich Letters, i., pp. 175—181. In it they give it as a reason for conformity to the habits, that otherwise "verily we should have a papistical, or at least a Lutherano-papistical ministry, or none at all." (Page 177.) See Soames's History of Reformation, vol. iv., p. 666; and Strype's Annals, vol. i., p. 178, Edit. 1725; and Hallam's Constitutional History, vol. i., p. 120, Edit. 1867.

tical Ministry" used by Grindal and Horn in writing to Bullinger. And this perhaps may have led to his being classed together with Cheney and Geste; and this again possibly to his being set down as one known to incline to the Lutherans. Now all this building—built (as it would seem) upon one hard name—we must even pull down and lay low: and acknowledging * indeed, what some contend for, that

* It must not be supposed that I am questioning at all the fact that the tendency of Parker's mind really was strongly and wisely conservative. Soames says of him, "Archbishop Parker was, probably, far less fond of such imposing externals than his royal mistress, though he hesitated at first, as to the expediency of retaining crosses. Having indeed, concealed himself at home during the Marian persecution, he had never seen Protestantism under any other form than that which it wore in Edward's reign. He had, accordingly, no thought of reconstructing a Church upon some alleged reference to Scripture merely—a principle hitherto unacknowledged by his countrymen. He was imbued with a deep veneration for antiquity, and had no further wish than to free the religious system immemorially established from blemishes detected by recent inquirers of undeniable competence. For this end he laboured with a patient industry, and a solidity of judgment, which have rendered most important services to the Reformation. The deliberate convictions of such a man could not fail of having great weight in the country, and they were justly entitled to it." (Soames's Elizabethan History, p. 15.)

"Parker had all the value for law and decency which experience imprints upon grave, wise, and elderly minds." (Ibid, p. 19.)

Dr. Lamb says, "He had an attachment, bordering upon veneration for ancient religious foundations." (Historical Account of 39 Art., Preface, p. 1.) He was apparently thought somewhat suspicious of the "Germanical natures" of some of the returned exiles. (See Sandys's Letter in Parker's Correspondence, p. 125.) He was also an admirer of "reverent mediocrity" of the Church of England. (See Correspondence, pp. 215 and 173.) But in Parker's "mediocrity" there was no want of fixedness of principle, no doctrinal

the tendency of Parker's mind and principles was to be conservative, we must contend that it was conservative above all of the great principles of the Reformation,* conservative, therefore, of the truth that the wicked eat not

concession of the truth which had been by the Reformation won back for the Church of England. (See especially his letter to Heath and the other deprived Bishops, in Correspondence, pp. 109—113.)

Cranmer too was not without some such conservative tendency; evidence of which may be seen in his letter of Oct. 7, 1552, given in J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, Historical Introduction, pp. xxxi., xxxii. The entire letter may also be seen in Perry on Declaration concerning Kneeling, pp. 77—79.)

* How determinately Parker stood on the principles of the Reformation, and how boldly he put himself forward to defend them, may be seen in the following extract from Strype (Parker, Book ii., chap. 8, p. 109)—"There was one Passage in the Queen's angry speech to the Archbishop, which as it startled him more than all the rest, so I cannot omit the mention of it. Which was, that she told him, she had other manner of Injunctions, which should follow; as tho' she had thoughts of setting out Injunctions in favour of Popery. For so the Archbishop seemed to understand her words, when reflecting upon them, he told the Secretary very seriously, 'That there would not be wanting of that Contemptible Flock, that would not shrink to offer their blood for the defence of Christ's Verity. And that he would be sorry, that the clergy should have cause to show their disobedience to her, and be forced to use the words of the Apostle, "we must obey God rather than men." . . . He trusted, that as she had begun godly in this good work [of Reforming Religion] so God would stay her heart, and move her to go on and to finish.'" (See Neal's History of Puritans, vol. i., pp. 118-9. Note.) Parker held the opinion of our Reformers (including Ridley,—see Works, p. 414, sqq.) that the Church of Rome is Babylon. He wrote "It is the pride, covetousness, and usurpation of the Bishop of Rome, and of his predecessors, which hath made the Princes of the Earth to defend their territories and their privileges from that wicked Babylon and her Bishop." (Correspondence, p. 109.)

the body of Christ, and therefore, with all its conservancy, destructive—utterly destructive—of the Real Objective Presence.

In support of this position we call back to witness (1) the *heading* of this Article (leaving the Article out of the question): for, whatever may be said of its relation to the Article, there can be nothing alleged against its evidence of Parker's own views. And if Parker had left us a treatise on this subject, and these words of his had come in the treatise, who would have hesitated to pronounce them decisive? Not, I feel sure, anyone acquainted with the language of our Reformers. Why should they be less decisive now that they stand as a title to an Article of Religion? (2) We call back to witness Parker's sanction of Whitgift's assertion*—of a piece with the teaching of his Book—that this Church hath rejected "the Real Presence." (3) We call back to witness the fact of Parker's careful review† and sanction of the "Reformatio Legum" with all its very exceedingly distinct and unequivocal utterances on this subject.‡ (4) We call back to witness the fact of

* See above, pp. 23, 32, 34, 35.

† See above on the "Reformatio Legum" in No. 4, p. 176, sqq. Strype says "He was the setter forth, I make little doubt, of the 'Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.' . . . Cranmer's own copy (with writings of P. Martyr who assisted) fell into Archbishop Parker's hands, and he reduced the titles into order, and had it fair written for the press—having then the assistance of J. Fox. (Strype's Parker, book iv., chap. xlv., p. 455.)

‡ See Paper No. 4, (especially p. 180) and Neal's History of Puritans, i., p. 43. That Parker should have reviewed the "Reformatio Legum" without expunging, or even altering—so as to modify the strength of—these *very* decided utterances, is surely quite unaccountable, if he really had anything like a leaning towards the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence in the Eucharist.

Parker's approval, and more than approval, of Jewel's* Apology, with all its emphatic opposition to the doctrine before us. (5) We call for witness the high value and esteem which Parker had for Bullinger,† whose very name was bound up with the doctrines of the Reformed.‡ (6)

* See Parker's Letter to Lady Bacon prefixed to her English translation of the Apology. (P. S. Edit., p. 51.) Herein the Archbishop says, "I am . . . enforced, not only to shew my rejoice of this your doing, but also to testify the same by this my writing prefixed before the work. . . . You have used your accustomed modesty in submitting it to judgment. . . . And, whereas *the chief Author of the Latin work and I*, severally *perusing and conferring your whole translation*, have without alteration allowed of it. . . . And now to the end both to acknowledge my good approbation, and to spread the benefit more largely, where your ladyship hath sent me your book written, I have with most hearty thanks returned it to you (as you see) printed."

Strype says that he gives this letter "Chiefly to reconcile a due value unto this piece, written on behalf of our Reformed Church; being thus *publickly owned and favoured* by the Chief Bishop of it in his time. The Epistle is printed before the edition of the book. And to make this treatise of the Church of England the more perfect, there is added at the end of it a small tract, entitled 'The manner how the Church of England is administered and governed,' which, I make no doubt, is the work of the Archbishop's own pen." (Strype's Parker, book ii., chap. xxv., p. 179.)

† "The Archbishop did join with the rest of his brethren the Bishops, in giving *all deference* to Henry Bullinger, Chief Pastor of the Church of Zurich: who had shewn great tenderness and regard to many learned exiles there under Queen Mary's reign: and who rejoiced at the Reformation in England." (Strype's Parker, book iv., chap. vi., p. 331.)

"I will not forget to write to M. Bullinger." (Jewel's Letter to Parker, Jan. 31, 1568, in Jewel's Works. P. S. Edit., iv., p. 1274.)

‡ See above, in Paper No. 4. Bellarmine says—"Zwinglium et Œcolampadium sequuti sunt permulti eorum discipuli, ac præcipuè Henricus Bullingerus Zwinglii successor, in sede Tigurina, qui

We call for witness Parker's high value of Archbishop Cranmer, whom some now regard as a Zuinglian heretic, but of whose MSS. Parker spoke as "the great notable written books of my predecessor Dr. Cranmer," adding "I would as much rejoice* while I am in the country to win them, as I would to restore an old chancel to reparation." (Correspondence, p. 186.)

And let it be remembered that among the treasured writings of Cranmer (and we know that he valued especially Cranmer's writings on† the Eucharist) Parker would find

scripsit Apologiam pro Zwinglio contra Lutheranos." (De Eucharistia, lib. i., cap. 1, p. 467 b.)

* "It was this year (1563) that Archbishop Parker recovered Cranmer's (his predecessor's) manuscripts. They were in the hands of Dr. Nevinson, prebendary of Canterbury. Nevinson denying their being in his custody, the Archbishop procured a letter from the Privy Council to search Nevinson's study, where they were found. They are two volumes in folio, collected from the Scriptures, Fathers, councils, and schoolmen, and digested into common places. The design of them was to justify the English Reformation, and show how far the modern Church of Rome had deserted the primitive doctrine, and gone off from the plan of antiquity. These volumes were transcribed by Parker, and they are now lodged in the library of the lord bishop of London." (Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. vi., pp. 394-5. See Strype's Parker, book ii., chap. 15.)

† The following extract from his work "De antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ" ought *alone* (I think) to suffice for the removal of all question as to Parker's Eucharistic views—"Cranmerus domi otium omne suum sacris literis impertivit; scripsitque contra pontificiorum sententiam illam crassam atque carnalem in sanctæ Cœnæ sacramento Christi præsentiam affirmantium, tanta doctrina et argumentorum copia refertum librum; ut ea controversia a nemine unquam contra pontificios accuratius tractata esse videatur."

the repudiation *passim* of the doctrine which the Ritualists would put in the Article, and not only so, but the indignant repudiation also of the very distinction by which they desire to effect this.

(7) We call for witness his dealing with Geste and Cheney, of whom we shall have more to say presently. Here it must suffice to state, that instead of its being true that Parker was sailing in the same boat with them, Geste evidently felt sorely the weight of Parker's opposition. And Cheney * was once deprived by Parker of the exercise of

(Quoted in Preface to Jenkyns's Edition of Cranmer's Works, pp. xcix. and c.)

[Whatever doubts may exist as to Parker's sole *authorship* of the entire work from which this extract is taken, there can be no question as to Parker's regarding himself as *responsible* for the contents of what he calls "My book of Canterbury Predecessors."]

* Parker's opinion of Cheney and his peculiar "contemplations" may appear somewhat from his writing to Cecil as follows, Aug. 1568—"I would be loth it [the bishoprick of Chichester] should fall upon one such body as, I am informed by his friends, make suit for it. We of this order learn by experience what rule Gloucester maketh in his people. He is so old that he would bring his people to his contemplations, which he laboureth to do, but spyeth that he shall never, and thereupon wisheth he were discharged, which he hath pretended a long time. But he meaneth another thing." (Parker's Correspondence. P. S. Edit., p. 332. See also p. 138.)

"Two Letters of D. Cheney, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, dat. Oct. 7 and 13, 1568, to Mr. Secretary Cecil, to prevent the ill impressions that might be made by a public complaint design'd agst his Sermons lately preacht in Bristol, and vindicating the Doctrines in them relating to free will and Real Presence." (Lansdowne MSS. No. 981; Bishop Kennett's Collection, vol. xlvii.)

An account of his preaching at Bristol, and the complaints made against him, and his defence, and his doctrine on the Eucharist, will

Episcopal jurisdiction which he had received by commission for Bristol, and once by Parker he was excommunicated. And both the withdrawal of the commission and

be found in Strype's Annals, vol. i., chap. 52, pp. 559—565. The account concludes thus, "That which I have further to add of this Bishop is, that his enemies laboured to remove him. But he had many friends (as well as adversaries) who valued him. And the Bishop of Chichester being now dead, they laboured much to get him translated thither. But the Archbishop understood it, and signified his dislike of it to the Secretary. And the Bishop himself upon these his Troubles, shewed a Desire to be quite discharged. But the ARCHBISHOP (who LIKED HIM NOT) told the Secretary, that perhaps he meant another thing, viz. to obtain a Reprimand to his enemies from the Court. The last thing I have to relate of him, was, that at length absenting himself from a Convocation, and not appearing upon Summons of the Archbishop, he was solemnly pronounced excommunicated by the same: but soon after absolved, because his absence was affirmed by his chaplain's oath, to be by reason of sickness."

Anthony A Wood says of Cheney, "One of his successors in the see of Gloc. named Godf. Goodman doth wonder why his master Will. Cambden should say that the said Rich. Cheyney was *Luthero addictissimus*, whereas it was certain that he was a papist, and bred up his servants papists, as he had been informed by one of them, with whom he had spoken. He tells also, that it doth appear upon record in the arches, that he was suspended for popery, and died so suspended, and never would make any recantation." (Athenæ Oxonienses, 1559-60, under "James Brokes." Edit. Bliss, 1815, vol. ii., pp. 791, 792.) Strype however says he did not find anywhere that Cheney was indeed of the Romish Faith "any further than that he was for the Real, that is, the Corporeal, Presence of Christ in the Sacrament." And he argues to the contrary from a letter written to him by Campian the Jesuit "who knew him well" (indeed Campian had been ordained and encouraged in his studies by him according to A Wood, "Athenæ Oxonienses," vol. i., p. 473, see also p. 476), in which "he tells him that he was *Hæreticorum*

the excommunication are supposed by Strype, and the excommunication is plainly understood by Geste, to be intimately connected with Cheney's Lutheran tendencies.*

Odium, et Catholicorum Pudor." Strype adds, "His suspension which is spoken of, (if true) related, no Question, partly to his being in the Queen's Debt, partly to his *Lutheran* Doctrine: but chiefly to his excommunication." (Annals, Anno 1562, vol. i., chap. 25, p. 282. See also Bennett's Essay on Articles, pp. 187—189. Edit. 1715.)

In the Disputation held in 1553, after Mary's accession, the Papists claimed Cheney as *allowing the presence with them*, and as having "subscribed to the Real Presence." But Cheney appears to have discomfited them by his arguments against *transubstantiation*. He firmly maintained the abiding of the material substance of the elements; and refused to allow the words of Theodoret to be wrested, as denying only *transaccidentation*. (See Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., pp. 397, 406, 407.)

* "Notice was taken at this session (which was April 23) that Richard, Bishop of Gloucester, had not appeared neither in person nor proxy, in any of these three sessions: and that he had been that day in Westminster, and was gone out of town without any leave asked of the President (whatever was the cause, whether, being Popishly affected in some things, he liked not what was to be done this Convocation, or whether he cared not to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, which was to be done by all the members of the synod, is unknown) . . . it was unanimously agreed by the Archbishop and his brethren, that he ought to be excommunicated, and consequently the Archbishop read the sentence of excommunication against him." (Strype's Parker, book iv., chap. v., pp. 318-9. See also Lamb's Historical Account of Thirty-nine Articles, pp. 27, 28; Hardwick on Articles, p. 152, note; and Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. ii., pp. 529—531.)

R. Cheney "was consecrated Bishop [of Gloucester]. . . . The Archbishop of Canterbury issued out a commission to him . . . . appointing him his Vicar General . . . . to visit, etc. . . . . The commission was

(8) We call to witness the character given of him by Puritans who disliking his ritual strictness charged* him with no doctrinal error.

(9) We call to bear witness also (and the witness is most important) that *consensus* as to doctrine generally, and the doctrine of the Eucharist in particular, a *consensus* of Churchmen and Puritans, which we know to have prevailed

dated May 3, [1562.] But it was not long before this Commission was taken away from him again, by the Archbishop, disliking most probably some of his principles and opinions. . . . In Sept. he [Cheney] renewed his request that he might have leave to resign his office . . . considering . . . such Preaching was continued in Gloucester Diocese, as his poor conscience could not think to be good. What this Preaching was, we may guess, and but guess at, by the remembrance of a former Bishop there, named Hooper; who did not much affect ceremonies . . . nor allowed of any manner of Corporeal Presence in the Sacrament. Which sentiments most probably were by him or his chaplains so diligently sown in that Diocese, that much of them remained to this day; opinions by no means liked by Bishop Cheney, who was, as Camden saith of him, most addicted to Luther; both in respect, I suppose of the Doctrine of the Presence, as also for the retaining of many old customs, as Crucifixes and Pictures of Saints in Churches and such like. He had made some complaints to the Archbishop of rash Preaching when he was at London; and the Archbishop promised him countenance in suppressing it. And accordingly he had a commission from his Grace, as was before said. But after some time he and his Principles were better known, and less approved: which caused the Archbishop, as we may conclude, to withdraw his commission. This made him tell the Secretary that his Grace of Canterbury acted contrary to his promise with him." (Strype's Annals, vol. i., chap. 25, pp. 279—281. See also p. 282. See also Strype's Parker, Book iv., chap. 5, p. 317.)

* See his character as given by Neal in History of Puritans, vol. i., pp. 223-4.

in Parker's days, a *consensus*, of the truth of which we have assurance, not from others* only, but from Parker himself,

* See evidence adduced in No. I., pp. 34—39. And add the following: "The admonitioners themselves (which said that they did strive for true religion, and wished the parliament even with perfect hatred to detest the Church of England, whereof notwithstanding they were members), even they do say how they (meaning the bishops and their partakers) hold the substance of religion with us, and we with them." . . . (Rogers. Preface to Catholic Doctrine, p. 8.)

"So that for doctrine (I mean still for the main points of doctrine) there was now a sweet and blessed concord among us, which unity continued all that holy and reverend father's, I mean Archbishop Parker's time, which was till the 17 year of Q. Elizabeth." (Ibid, pp. 8, 9.)

This general *consent* on the doctrine of the Eucharist, in the reign of Elizabeth, was but a restoration of the *unanimity* of English Divines on the subject in the latter years of Edward's reign. See the letter of Peter Martyr quoted below, p. 689. See also Paper No. III., pp. 160—165. The following is the testimony of John A Lasco—"Addidit gratiam suam Dominus, ut primariæ Helvetiorum Ecclesiæ quæ anteà dissidebant inter se primum omnium consentirent. Cœpit deindè mox latius propagari doctrinæ *consensio*, etiamsi non iisdem ubique verbis exprimeretur: et ad Frisiam usque, atque item ad florentissimum hoc Angliæ Regnum pervenit, manuque (quod dicitur) utraque (Divino beneficio) retinetur." ("Epistola at Regem" prefixed to "Brevis et Dilucida de Sacramentis Ecclesiæ Christi Tractatio." London, 1552.)

The following extract from the Paper against altars drawn up by the Divines (most probably including Parker) in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, will show clearly what were their feelings towards the Reformed and toward the Lutherans: "It may please your Grace also to call to remembrance, that the greatest learned men of the world, as Bucer, Œcolampadius, Zuinglius, Bullinger, Calvin, Martyr, Joannes Alasco, Hedio, Capito, and many more, have in their Reformed Churches in Sabaudia, Helvetia, Basil, Geneva, Argentine, Worms, Frankford, and other places, always

and which others have attributed very much to Parker's own influence.*

(10) We call to bear witness Parker's declared estimation of Peter Martyr and Calvin, and that especially in regard of the controversy with Rome.†

(11) We call for witness Nowell's express and emphatic

taken away the altars; only Luther and his churches have retained them. In the which churches be some other more imperfections, as gilding of images, the Service of the Church half Latin, half Dutch, and the Elevation of the Sacrament of the Altar. All which things Melancthon, when he is called to council for a reformation to be had in other places, doth utterly remove. And in Saxony they are tolerated hitherto, only because of Luther's fame; but are thought that they will not long continue, being so much disliked of the best learned. . . . It may also please your Majesty to join hereunto the judgment of the learned and godly martyrs of this realm, who of late have given their lives for the testimony of this truth; as of Dr. Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, who protested in writing (whereupon he was first apprehended) that the order appointed by the last book of King Edward, was most agreeable to the Scriptures and the use of the Primitive Church: and also of Dr. Ridley, Bishop of London, who travailed especially in this matter of altars, and put certain reasons of his doing in print, which remain to this day: of Mr. Latimer, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Bradford, and all the rest, who to the end, did stand in defence of that book. So that, by re-edifying of altars, we shall also seem to join with the adversaries that burnt those good men, in condemning some part of their doctrine." (Strype's Annals, vol. i., p. 162. Edit. 1725. See also Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 67, 68.)

* "A principal contriver of this unformity in religion, and thereby unity among us, was another predecessor of your grace's, even D. Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the said Queen's days." . . . (Rogers, Preface to Catholic Doctrine, p. 6.)

† "Upon hearing of a Diet for conference of learned men appointed in France, I wished that Mr. Martyr, or Calvin, or both, could be procured thither; they were as able to stand in defence of a

denial* of the charge when made by a Romanist in the lifetime of Parker himself.

truth, assisted by him whose cause it is." (Letter to Cecil in Correspondence, p. 147, date 1561, referring to the Conference between Roman Catholics and Protestants held at Poissy.)

In order to estimate aright the bearing of this letter of Parker's on the question of his views on the Eucharist, they may be read in connexion with the following account of the Conference at Poissy (Sept. 1561). "The Romish party, who assembled in considerable numbers, were confronted by Calvin's chief disciple, the accomplished Theodore Beza, and by other ministers and lay-deputies of the Huguenots: THE MAIN *subjects of* DISCUSSION being the DOCTRINE *of the* EUCHARIST, and what was even more intractable, the jurisdiction and Authority of the Church. THE PRINCIPLES *of the* SWISS REFORMERS were also ably advocated by Peter Martyr, who arrived from Zurich while the Colloquy was proceeding." (Hardwick's History of Reformation, p. 138.) Grindal wrote to Cecil to much the same effect as Parker. (See his Remains, pp. 244-5 and note See also Jewel; Sermon and Harding, pp. 89 and 94.) Further evidence of Parker's esteem for Martyr may be seen in his *Antiq Britann.*, as quoted in Goode's "Brotherly Communion," pp. 8, 9,

* Strype writes, "It may be noted, that the Divines in those times seemed not fully agreed in the Doctrine of the Presence: i we may believe what Dorman writ soon after this synod [1562] viz., That there was a controversy in this New Church (as he calle it) concerning the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in th Sacrament. And that Mr. Gest preaching at Rochester, (where h was Bishop) preached for the Real Presence. Mr. Grindal at Lon don (where he was Bishop) for the contrary. To which Dorma added, (to make the Difference in this Article seem greater) tha Mr. D. Parker of Canterbury (as he stiled him) being suspected, h said, to be a Lutheran, must hold a third opinion of the Presence To which it is worth observing as to the Truth of this charge, wha reply Dr. Nowell makes: 'That these were small Matters in com parison, however, he called them by the name of Schism, and tha they little troubled the State of the Church; while he named one a divers from other in Opinion in one point, and FALSELY *surmised*

(12) We call for witness his urging (in conjunction with Grindal) the publication of Nowell's Catechism,* whose language on the subject is much too plain and emphatic to be approved by those who hold the Corporal Presence.

(13) We appeal also to Parker's identifying himself with the movement which waged war against *altars*, and would have the Lord's Supper administered at a moveable table of wood.†

another, (*meaning* THE ARCHBISHOP) *to be a* LUTHERAN." (Annals, vol. i., chap. 28, pp. 334-5. See Hardwick on Articles, p. 138, note.)

Let it be observed that we have not only Nowell's *positive* DENIAL of Dorman's insinuation concerning Parker; but we have also the testimony of Parker himself (see Paper No. I., pp. 34, 35) and abundant other evidence (see Paper No. I., pp. 37—39, and note above, p. 644) in proof of the *oneness* of doctrine, and agreement concerning the Eucharist (not of course, to be understood as altogether *without exception*) in Parker's time. See also Bennett, Essay on Articles, p. 187. Edit. 1715.

* See above, p. 190. There is evidence of Parker's careful perusal and criticism of Nowell's Catechism, and especially in the part concerning the Eucharist. Bishop Jacobson says, "Archbishop Parker has underlined . . . *eaque conjunctione* . . . with his red pencil, and made a note in the margin, which appears to be . . . *hic inserenda plenior vis*, etc." (Note on p. 170.) In compliance with this hint of Archbishop Parker the next Question and answer appear to have been inserted—(See Jacobson's note on "An Ergo," etc., p. 171,) pointing to the equivalent efficacy of Baptism, whereby *likewise we are of* Christ's *flesh and bones*. There is a MS. of the Catechism with the autographs of Parker and Grindal at the beginning, and repeated with their approval of the work, in the last page. (See Bishop Jacobson's Preface, p. xix., and quotation from Strype in note m.)

† Strype, indeed, speaks only of the address presented to Queen Elizabeth on this subject, as coming from the Divines, among whom he supposes "most *probably* Parker." (See Annals, chap. xii., pp. 159, 160. Edit. 1725. The paper may be seen in Blakeney on

To all this mass of evidence might be added many lesser matters not without their weight; such as * Ridley's confidence in him, and Jewel's;† his friendship with Becon;‡ his value for Whitgift; his very tender affection for Jewel;§ his pleading (with other bishops) ‖ against images; his

Common Prayer, pp. 65—69.) A question, however, might *possibly* be made of this. And further evidence has been sought in vain among the State Papers, and the Lansdowne MSS.

But sufficient warrant for what is alleged in the text, will be found, I believe, in the extract from the Ely Episcopal Registers, given in Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, p. 213. (See also p. 209.)

* "Sir, I pray you refuse not to take a day at the Cross: I may have, if I would call without any choice, enow; but in some, alas! I desire more learning, in some a better judgment, in some more virtue and godly conversation, in some more soberness and discretion. And he in whom all these do concur shall not do well to refuse (in my judgment) to serve God in that place; of the which number by cause I take you to be, &c." (Ridley—Letter to Parker, dated July 25, 1551; in Parker's Correspondence, p. 45.)

† "Your Grace is *sacra anchora* unto me and others." (Jewel's Letter to Parker, June 16, 1563; in Jewel's Works, P. S. Edit., vol. iv., p. 1262.)

‡ See Becon's Letter to Parker in Biographical Notice. (Becon's Works, P. S. Edit., i., p. xiii.)

§ "The death of one so VERY DEAR to the Archbishop was *extremely afflictive* to him." (Strype's Parker, bk. iv., ch. v., p. 317. See also Annals, vol. i., ch. xxv., p. 281.)

‖ The letter of Archbishop Parker and others to Queen Elizabeth against images may be seen in his Correspondence, pp. 79—95. The discovery of a *pia fraus* of the Papists, by which an image of the Saviour was made to sweat blood in Dublin, took place about this time. "The Archbishop of Dublin wrote this relation, and to this effect, to his brother-Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker,

desire for the removal of lights and crucifix * from the

who was at this time *very joyful at the receipt* hereof, by reason that the clergy were at this present debating whether the images should stand in the churches or no, the Queen herself being then indifferent whether to have images or to destroy them. This letter being shewed unto her Majesty, wrought on her *to consent* for throwing of images out of the churches, together with those texts of Scripture as the *Archbishop of Canterbury* and other divines gave her for the demolishing of them." (See Parker's Correspondence, p. 96.)

* See Machyn's Diary, p. 226.

From the account of the disputation on this subject, in which Parker and Cox were on side, Grindal and Jewel on the other (see Zurich Letters, i., 67, 68; ii. 41, 43), some have apparently been led to think that Parker and Cox must have been decidedly in favour of the crucifix. (See Hardwick, History of Reformation, p. 246, note 4.)

That this was not so as regards Cox, is clear from his letter to Cassander (Zurich Letters, ii., 41), and still more from his letter to P. Martyr (Zurich Letters, i., 66), in which he says—"We are only constrained, to *our great distress of mind*, to tolerate in our churches the image of the cross and Him who was crucified: the Lord must be entreated that this stumbling-block may at length be removed." Indeed, Strype says that Cox, being appointed to minister the Sacrament before the Queen in her chapel, "made it a matter of conscience to do it in a place which he thought so dishonoured by images, and could scarce be brought to officiate there, denying it a great while; and when he did it, it was with a trembling conscience, as he said." (Quoted in Zurich Letters, i., p. 66, note. See also his letter to the Queen in Strype's Annals, vol. i., Appendix, No. 22, p. 60; Edit. 1725.)

That it is a mistake also as regards Parker, is evident from (1) the letter of Sir Francis Knollys to him (in Parker's Correspondence, p. 97)—"Wishing you prosperity in all godliness; namely, in your good enterprise against the enormities yet in the Queen's closet retained;" and (2) from Parker's own letter to Cecil, after the cross

Queen's closet; his care to have Foxe's "Acts and Monuments" set up in all cathedral churches;* his editing the

was "brought into the chapel again," in which Parker declares—"Certainly I never knew of it, nor yet in good faith I think it expedient it should be restored." (Correspondence, p. 379.) See also Parker's Letter to Cecil, Nov. 6, 1559 (Correspondence, p. 105); and Strype's "Parker," bk. i., ch. ix., p. 46; and bk. iv., ch. iii., p. 310. See also Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 284—286.

Mr. Keble speaks of the Queen continuing the cross and lights in her private chapel, "in spite of so many remonstrances from her *chaplains* of *the Frankfort and Genevan schools*.." (On Euch. Adoration, Edit. 1867, pp. 149, 150.)

According to this, Parker must have belonged to one of these schools, though his objections may have been somewhat less *pronounced* than those of some others. Hallam says—"I conceive by *cruces* (in Jewel's letter to Martyr) we are to understand crucifixes, not mere crosses; though I do not find the word, even in Du Cange, used in the former sense." (Constitutional History, vol. i., p. 173.)

Cassander was in doubt whether his opinion was asked concerning *crosses* merely or *crucifixes* properly. (2 Zur., 43.) But they are called *crucifixes* distinctly. (2 Zur., 41; 1 Zur., 67.) P. Martyr speaks of the *image* of the crucifix. (2 Zur., pp. 25, 47.) And all doubt seems to be removed by the words of Bishop Cox: "The image of the cross and *Him who was crucified*." (1 Zur., 66; where see note.)

Compare Bishop Cox's words. (2 Zur., 41.) See also 1 Zur., 63, 64, 122; and Strype's Annals, i., p. 175; Edit. 1725. It will be seen that Strype certainly understands that it was a crucifix which was retained in the Queen's chapel. See also Blakeney on Common Prayer, p. 279; and Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," p. 435.

"Notum est, reginam Parkero antistite Cantuariensi *acriter repugnante* retinuisse in secello suo imaginem crucifixi cum candelabris atque candelis. . . . . Attamen . . . . abrogavit elevationem hostiæ." (Daniel's Codex Liturgicus, tom. iii., p. 300.)

* See Paper No. V, p. 223.

Saxon Homily of Ælfric;* his high esteem among those

* The following is a part of the Preface to this Homily:—"As the writynges of the fathers euen of the first age of the Churche bee not thought on all partes so perfect, that whatsoeuer thyng hath been of them spoken ought to be receaued without all exception (which honour trulye them selues both knewe and also haue confessed to be onely due to the most holy and tryed word of God:) So in this sermon here published, some thynges be spoken not consonant to sounde doctrine: but rather to such corruption of greate ignorance and superstition, as hath taken roote in the church of long time, being ouermuch cumbered with monckery. As when it speaketh of the masse to be profitable to the quicke and dead: of the mixture of water with wyne: and whereas here is also made reporte ij. vayne miracles, which notwithstanding seeme to haue been infarced, for that they stand in their place enaptly, and without purpose, and the matter without them, both before and after, doth hange in itselfe together most orderly: with some other suspitious wordes sounding to superstition. But all these things that be thus of some reprehension, be as it wer but by the way touched: the full and whole discourse of all the former part of the Sermon, and almost of the whole Sermon, is about the vnderstanding of the sacramentall bread and wine howe it is the bodye and bloude of Christ our Saviour, by which is reuealed and made known, what hath been the common taught doctrine of the Church of England on this behalfe many hundreth yeares agoe, contrarye vnto the vnaduised writyng of some nowe a dayes." (Thompson's Edit., pp. lvi., lvii.)

This Preface is signed by Archbishop Parker, the Archbishop of York, and thirteen other bishops; but not (as Deane Goode observes—Supple., p. 14) by Geste or Cheney.

The following is an extract from the Homily:—"The Apostle Paule sayth, that the Israelites did eat the same ghostly meate, and drink the same ghostly drinke: bycause the heauenly meate that fedde them fourtye yeares, and the water which from the stone did flowe, had signification of Christe's bodye, and his bloude, that nowe be offered daylye in God's churche. It was the same which we now offer: not bodely, but ghostly. We sayd vnto you a little before,

who were far from esteeming highly men of Lutheran views;*

that Christ halowed bread and wyne to housell before his suffering, and sayd: This is my body and my bloud. Yet he had not then suffred; but so notwithstanding he turned through inuisible might the bread to hys owne body, and the wyne to his bloode, as he before did in the wildernes, before that he was borne a man, when he turned that heauenly meate to his fleshe and the flowing water from the stone to hys owne bloude." (Thompson's Edit., pp. 31, 32.)

Of the doctrine taught by this Homily, in the part referred to in the Preface with comparative approbation, it has been very truly said—"It is undeniably not that of a real presence of Christ's body in or under the elements, but that the elements become in a mystical and spiritual sense Christ's body and blood, as having a spiritual power and influence imparted to them. This is not precisely the doctrine of our best divines; for, as Hooker says, the sacraments are not really, nor do really contain in themselves, that grace which, with them or by them, it pleaseth God to bestow. . . . . But it is very different from what is called the doctrine of the Real Presence; and the difference between it and the sounder doctrine delivered by Hooker is, comparatively, of secondary importance." (Goode on Eucharist, ii., Supplem., p. 14. See Archbishop Ussher's Answer to Jesuit's Challenge—Works, vol. iii., pp. 85—88; Archbishop Wake's "Second Defence," in Gibson's Preservative, xii., p. 390; Soames's Anglo-Saxon Church, p. 229; Hook's Lives of Archbishops, vol. i., p. 443; Collier's Eccles. Hist., vol. i., pp. 481—485; Freeman's Principles of Divine Service, vol. ii., part i., p. 82; Soames's Elizabethan History, pp. 210, 211; and History of Reformation, vol. iii., pp. 158—165. Also Soames's Latin Church during Anglo-Saxon Times, pp. 423—433, and p. 466.)

* "There have lately been removed from us by death, having obtained a better condition with Christ, Parkhurst, the Bishop of Norwich, and Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England, a man of an even and firm character, and a *zealous defender of true religion.* We must entreat the Lord that He may vouchsafe to send labourers not less suitable into His harvest."

his care to have "The Defence of the Apology" placed in Parish Churches;* his glorying in having been consecrated without "Aaronical garments" "according to the purity of the Gospel."†

(Bishop Cox to Rodolph Gualter, date 1575, in Zurich Letters, i., p. 317.)

Cox's own opinions may be seen in Original Letters, p. 753, and Zurich Letters, ii., pp. 249, 253.

See also Fulke's "Answers," p. 247. This was not the sort of language in which men of opposite views commonly spoke of those who held anything like the Lutheran "Real Presence." By way of contrast, the reader may like to be referred to what Burcher says of Bucer and Fagius, in letter to Bullinger. (Original Letters, pp. 662, 663.) But it must not be supposed that his words echoed the opinion held of Bucer in England.

Fuller says—"He [Parker] confuted the character which one gives of antiquaries, 'that generally they are either superstitious or supercilious,' his skill in antiquity being attended with soundness of doctrine and humility of manners." (Fuller's History, vol. ii., p. 285; Edit. Oxford, 1845.)

* See Biographical Memoir of Jewel in Jewel's Works, P. S. Edit., p. xxviii. Parker therefore must have read and approved the "Defence" in which is contained the repudiation of the distinction between "real receiving" and "effectual receiving," as well as the most clear and distinct opposition to the Corporal Presence.

† See Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i., p. 129, and Strype's Parker, book ii., chap. i., p. 61. "He was both the first and only man that attained unto the archbishoplike dignity without any blemish or spot of old wives' superstitions and unprofitable ceremonies of the Romish Pope, for as every one of them entered first hereunto by bulls of approbation sent from the Pope: so he was consecrated neither with them, nor any other old and idle ceremonies of Aaron's ornaments, neither with gloves, nor sandals, nor slippers, nor mitre, nor pall, but more chastely and religiously according to the purity of the Gospel, four bishops being appointed

Let this evidence be weighed in the balances of unprejudiced justice, and, I think, judgment will be given to the effect, that instead of the known opinions of Parker having to be set against the arguments for the natural meaning of our Article—what we can gather* of his opinions will

according to a law made in that behalf which placed him in his chair with so godly promises protested by him, as it is meet should of a gospel-like pastor." ("The Life of the 70th Archbishop of Canterbury presently sitting Englished," 1574. B. iii., B. iv.)

* The great historical work of the *Magdebury centuriators* is not unfrequently referred to by our Reformers. In it the history of the Church is "regarded from the standing-ground of Luther." (See Hardwick's Reformation, p. 406.) The *fourth century* was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, in 1560; and we have a courteous letter from Archbishop Parker to "Matt. Flacius Illyricus and others," returning thanks for a copy. (Zurich Letters, ii., pp. 77—80.) Flacius Illyricus, a strict Lutheran, was the principal writer of the history. The following extract from Parker's letter will show how far he was from professing himself in harmony with the distinguishing doctrines of the Centuriators: "Which doctrine and belief of yours, however it may fail of pleasing every one, yet I openly admit that you have acted ingenuously and sincerely, in having so fully, so entirely, and so clearly and unambiguously declared your mind and sentiments. Yet, upon due consideration of these your opinions, I cannot but lament that there should be some disagreement among us upon the chief controversies of religion, especially as each party is taught by the same rule of Scripture, and animated by the same zeal both for the restoration of the truth and the utter extermination of all error and falsehood from the territories of the Church of Christ. Oh, how great an occasion of falling is here presented to good men! how greatly on this ground is the very restoration of the gospel loaded with reproaches and revilings by our enemies! I wish indeed, that each party would listen to the other without prejudice, and with greater patience and attention; and that neither should be so wedded to his opinion, as to render this public cause of religion an occasion of glorying, ambition and dissent." (Page 78.)

rather tend to strengthen (if it needed strengthening) our position—and lead us to see here a true disciple of Cranmer, exercising a wise vigilance, after the example of his master, lest the Roots of Evil in the doctrine of the Real Presence should be suffered to grow again in the Lord's vineyard, and overspread all the ground afresh with the old errors and superstitions.

But we have not yet quite done with Parker. Or rather our opponents have something further to allege* concerning his part in this article. We have a letter from Parker to Lord Burleigh about it. Some one† had evidently sugges-

* See Pusey's "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," p. 237. Forbes on Articles, ii., 588-9. Grueber's Reply to Dr. Heurtley, p. 41.

† Strype says (Parker, book iv., chap. vi., p. 331), "I cannot omit here the mentioning of an argument disputed between the Lord Treasurer and the Archbishop, especially because it relates to one of the Nine and Thirty Articles of Religion, viz.: the twenty-ninth article, *concerning the wicked, that eat not the body of Christ*. Which was not among the Articles of Religion established under King Edward, anno 1552. Some, it seems, had raised a scruple of the sentence of St. Augustine, alleged there, *put in for proof of it, by the Archbishop himself*. And in the first draught of the Articles remaining in Benet's College, in the margin, against this Father's sentence, in the place thereof written by the Archbishop's pen, viz.: Super Joann., tract 26. . . . It seems some Papists had been nibbling at this new Article, and at the said allegation, and in discourse with the Treasurer had declared it to him." See also Annals, chap. 28, pp. 326, 327, ann. 1562.

With Geste's letters, and what we know of the circumstances, before us, I shall be surprised if some of my Readers do not make a shrewd guess that the "*nibbling*" came from some to whom Lord Burleigh would be more likely to listen in this matter than to Papists, and who would be much more likely to give themselves the trouble of

ted to Burleigh's mind a doubt as to whether the citation in this Article from St. Augustine would be found to establish the teaching of the Article. Burleigh leaves the question to be resolved by Parker, and Parker's letter declares, that having reconsidered the matter, he is of opinion the citation will hold good for so much as it is quoted for. But the whole letter shall be given here.

Archbishop Parker to Lord Burghley, 4th June, 1571:—"Sir, I have considered what your honour said to me this day, concerning St. Augustine's authority in the Article in the first original agreed upon; and I am advisedly still in mine opinion concerning so much wherefore they be alleged in the Article; and for further truth of the words, besides St. Austen, both he in other places, and Prosper, in his 'Sentences wrote of Austen' (Senten. 338 and 339), doth plainly affirm our opinion in the Article to be most true, howsoever some men vary from it." (Parker's Correspondence, p. 381.)

Now the argument of our opponents from this letter stands thus:—the words, "for so much" clearly imply a limitation. They imply that Augustine's words* might in

speaking to Lord Burleigh about it—and that Parker had made the same shrewd guess before, a guess which would require no divination from one who knew well *some* that now *varied from* the teaching of the Article.

* So Dr. Redmayne, after specially alluding to an objection brought from St. Augustine, declared his conviction that the objection was groundless, however some might *vary from* this teaching. The following is from the declaration of Dr. Young: "*To the Fifth Article:*—Imprimis, that Dr. Redman said more, whereas St. Augustine said 'Quod Judas idem accepit quod Petrus,' that Judas received the same that Peter did; he said, that he understood that of the *Sacrament;* and after the same phrase a man might say, 'Quod Simon Magus idem baptisma recipit quod Apostoli,' 'That Simon Magus received the same baptism that the apostles did,' when he did receive only the *outward sacrament* to his condemnation; for he said

error have been cited for more, but that the Article only means to cite them with a limited application, and that for that limited application they hold good. But in the natural sense of the article they do not seem to be limited at all.

The answer to this is very simple. Augustine, while asserting that the wicked do not eat Christ's body —asserted also that, *in a certain* SENSE (or in a CERTAIN WAY) they *did* receive Christ's body, because they received the sacrament of His body, and the sacrament bears the name of the thing signified by it. Now the doubt that would naturally arise was this:—Could the Article which asserts that the wicked are *nowise* partakers of Christ claim support from Augustine's words, when he said also that in *some* sense * they do receive his body and blood? †

And Parker's reply is worthy of a disciple of Cranmer—that the citation is good for so much as the Article says; for the Article is speaking of things REALLY, of a REAL

that he thought Christ would not vouchsafe to give His holy flesh to an ungodly man; and this, he said, was always his mind, although he knew well that *other men did otherwise think*." (See Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., p. 270; and compare Young's Letter, pp. 272, 273.)

* So Chap. ix. of the "Consensus Orthodoxus," has this heading:—"Quomodo Impii et indigni manducare dicantur Corpus Christi, et de duplici ejus apud patres appellatione," and in that chapter it is said "Quo enim modo panis Eucharistiæ est, et dicitur Corpus Christi (hoc est, in mysterio et sacramento) eo etiam modo panem Eucharistia manducantes, Augustino Corpus Christi manducare dicuntur." (p. 389.)

† On the subject of this letter and the omission of the marginal note, see Bennett's Essay on Articles, pp. 338—341, Edit. 1715; and Swainson's Essay on Art. xxix., pp. 40, 41.)

reception; and does not go beyond that to deny what may be said to be done or received sacramentally,* *i. e.*, NOT

* Bishop Morton says, "Where [*i.e.*, in the place of St. Augustine] we have a flat opposition, between that which is called (*Revera*) a *real eating*, against *eating only sacramentally*. So that the Antithesis falling between these terms, of eating Christ's body *(Revera, indeed)*, by the godly, and of eating it only *(Sacramento tenus), as much as to say*, NOT INDEED, by the wicked. It must necessarily follow, that the wicked do NOT EAT, INDEED, THE BODY OF CHRIST." (On Eucharist, book v., ch. ii., sec. 9., p. 324—Edit. 1635) and a little further on, referring to another place of St. Augustine, he says, "The only answer which your Cardinal vouchsafeth is, that *Saint Augustine* spake so, because Judas ate the body of Christ UNPROFITABLY, as if the *difference* of EATING, and NOT EATING Christ's body had been between the *different* EFFECTS, eating *profitably*, and *not profitably*, which you call *spiritually*, and *not spiritually*, which is the EVASION OF OTHERS; whereas indeed the comparison is expressly between the divers SUBJECT MATTERS of EATING. The one being *Bread, the Lord*, which is Christ's body, the other being *the bread of the Lord*, which is the sacramental bread." (p. 325.)

"Etsi Augustinus Impios et indignos carnem Christi in Sacramento manducare dicat: tamen quia, quæ *in Sacramento* fiunt ab eo, quod est *in re et veritate*, velut *relativè* opposita, distinguit, ideo *non tribuit* illis VERAM Carnis Christi manducationem. . . . . Promiscua est horum significatio apud Augustinum: *Sacramentam Corporis Christi; Solum in Sacramento Corpus*, et *caro in sacramento*, quæ passim negat idem esse quod Christus, seu ipsum *revera* Christi Corpus. . . . . Cæterum quia corporalia hæc sacramenta, etiam ipsarum rerum nominibus, quarum Sacramenta sunt, appellantur adeoque panis Eucharistiæ suo modo vocatur Christi corpus, quia videlicet tam magnæ rei est sacramentum. . . . . Duplex est inde Augustino et Patribus, Corpus Christi, Sacramentale, et Verum. Sacramentale corpus nihil aliud est, quam ipsum veri Corporis sacramentum, eo loquendi modo, quo (ut sæpius est annotatum) signum quod significat, rei significatæ nomine appellatur. . . . . Secundum hanc diversam Corporis Christi appellationem, alios *in*

REALLY. On this understanding everything in Parker's letter is intelligible, and free (I believe) from all difficulties. But how great a difficulty would be found in it if we were to read it on the other hypothesis!

Here we have Parker clearly declaring that *some* men vary from "our opinion in the Article." Now we know very well there were *some* (Cheney and Geste to wit) who *did* think otherwise than the natural sense of the Article we are contending for. But will any one maintain that *some* were thinking otherwise than *that sense* of the Article

Sacramento vel *Sacramento tenus*, alios REVERA manducare docet." ("Consensus Orthodoxus," pp. 387—389.)

Thus Beza writes, "Posset tamen propter nonnullos ex Patribus tolerari hoc dictum, Corpus Christi sumi a quibusvis, et a fidelibus quidem dignè, ad vitam: ab infidelibus autem indignè ad judicium. Sed necessario addenda esset interpretatio, quæ hoc verum esse doceat, quatenus rei signatæ, id est, Corporis nomen ad ipsa signa transfertur." (Tract. Theol. Genev. 1582. Vol. i., p. 210.)

Again, "Excipies Augustinum dicere non tantum *dari corpus*, sed etiam, *manducari, bibi, sumi, accepi, percipi indigne*. Fateor, sed ea nimirum ratione qua rei significatæ nomen signo tribui alibi declaravit." (Ibid, p. 248.)

"Expendant lectores antitheta, *Sacramento tenus*, et *re vera edere;* et nulla restabit dubitatio." (Calvin. Instit. lib. iv., cap xvii., § 34.)

In some such a sense even Hospinian says, "Non negamus accipi a malis: Dominus enim Author Sacramenti sui, Judæ proditori suo (ut Augustinus et alii volunt) panem tanquam Corpus suum porrexit eo et dedit. Et porrectum atque datum Judas accepit." (In Works, Vol. iv., p. 274.) This was written, however, with the view to justify the acceptance (as by the pacific Bucer and others) of such Lutheran tests on this point, as could only, I think, be accepted with something like dissimulation, or a consciousness of ambiguity, inasmuch as we can hardly doubt they were intended by the Lutherans to be understood *re vera*, however Bucer may have (from excellent motives) persuaded himself to the contrary.

which alone the Ritualists would leave in it? Were there any then—any Divines—any English Theologians—any Bishops or Clergy—who were really of opinion that the wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith—do, in receiving the Lord's Supper, receive Christ effectually and savingly to their soul's health?*

* No doubt those who held the Corporal Presence might be very sensible of the danger of their doctrine being perverted, and very desirous therefore to guard it against popular misconceptions. (See Denison's Saravia, p. 143, and Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 417.) But it is hardly to meet popular misconceptions alone that an Article of Religion should have been purposely framed and added to a collection which had been regarded as complete; especially as any such misconception might very well be said to have already been cut away in the words which concluded the 25th Article: "In such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith." It seems difficult to discover what (upon the hypothesis of our opponents) the teaching of the 29th Article would have added to this.

It would, then, have been very hard to believe, without this letter, that Parker had taken pains, in spite of opposition, to bring in a separate and additional Article to be added to "Articles of Religion," and "for avoiding diversities of opinion," which additional Article should assert nothing but what might be called a theological truism, and be aimed at nothing but such a gross popular error, as (on Saravia's testimony, p. 111) "no man in his senses hath ever affirmed," and as no one, I suppose, with any degree of education would at that time have thought of maintaining. But it is more than very hard to believe this, in the face of Parker's own assertion, that some now *do* "vary from" our opinion in the Article.

This argument may be yet further strengthened by appeal to the "notable paper," drawn up in preparation for the Synod, 1562, with marginal notes, "some writ by the Archbishop [Parker] himself." (See Strype's Annals, vol. i., part i., chap. xxvii., p. 317,) entitled,

If not, then it is perfectly evident that this non-natural sense could not be the sense which Parker attached to the Article, because there *were some* who were opposed to THAT SENSE.

It will probably be felt that sufficient evidence has been here adduced to defend the natural sense of the Article from the force of any arguments arising from the views and writings of Archbishop Parker.

But there remains something yet very material to be added.

Add to all this the extreme improbability (should we not rather say the utter impossibility?) of an admirer of Cranmer, using language in framing both the title and the substance of an Article—language in accordance with the heading and the substance of an important* section of Cranmer's most

"General Notes of Matters to be Moved by the Clergy in the next Parliament and Synod."

Among these Notes are mentioned "Certain Articles, containing the principal grounds of Christian Religion, are to be set forth (in the which also is to be determined the TRUTH *of those things which* IN THIS AGE *are* CALLED IN CONTROVERSY,) much like to such Articles as were set forth a little before the death of King Edward."

* Could Parker have studied Cranmer's writings and never have noticed this important section? If any one will maintain that possibly it may have escaped his observation and study, then let the following extract from Strype be commended to his consideration:—

"And that I may bring here together all that relates to Cranmer, as to this matter of the Sacrament, I must not omit what I saw in the Benet Library. There is a thin Note-book of this Archbishop's with this Title, wrote by his own Hand, *De re Sacramentaria*, which I verily believe are his Meditations and Conclusions, when he set himself accurately to examine the Sacramental controversy, and fell off from the opinion of the Carnal Presence. The Notes consist of nothing but quotations out of ancient ecclesiastical authors about

important work—and supporting that language, as Cranmer there supports it, by appeal to S. Augustin—and yet withal meaning by this language and this appeal, to teach a doctrine utterly discordant from, and in direct opposition to, that which in the treatise of Cranmer stands out with the more unmistakeable clearness, because there it is seen as set in battle array against the very opinions and arguments now aimed against it by the Ritualists, and then * by the Papist Gardiner.

the Lord's Supper, interlined in many places by the Archbishop's pen. On the top of some of the pages are these sentences writ by himself, being doctrines provable out of the sentences there produced, and transcribed—

Panis vocatur Corpus Christi, et Vinum Sanguis

Panis est Corpus meum et Vinum est Sanguis meus; *figurativæ sunt locutiones.*

Quid significat hæc figura, edere carnem et bibere sanguinem.

Mali non edunt et bibunt Corpus et sanguinem Domini.

Patres Vet: Testamenti, edebant et bibebant Christum, sicut et nos.

Sicut in Eucharistiâ ita in Baptismo, presens est Christus. Contra Transubstantitionem.

After this follow these writings of the Archbishop's own Hand (*which Archbishop* Parker *elsewhere* transcribed *for* his own satisfaction.)" (Strype's Cranmer, book ii., chap. xxv., p. 262.)

* Lest the reader should think that such a statement must be either a mistake or a grievous exaggeration, I will set down a few sentences, taken here and there out of Gardiner's words, to which Cranmer replies. Gardiner says—"Wherefore if it be more than a figure, as it is indeed, and if by Christ's ordinance it hath present, under the form of those visible signs of bread and wine, the very body and blood of Christ, as hath been truly taught hitherto, then is the substance of the Sacrament one always, as the ointment was, whether doves eat of it or beetles. And this issue I join with this

Shall we think that Parker put into an Article of Religion expressions such as Cranmer distinctly stigmatizes as "PARADOXES," and of which he declares that however they may sometimes (though rarely) be used, yet when the VERY

author, that he shall not be able by any learning to make any diversity in the substance of this Sacrament, whatsoever diversity follow in the effect. For the diversity of the effect is occasioned in them that receive, as before is proved. And then, to answer this author, I say that only good men eat and drink the body and blood of Christ spiritually, as I have declared, but all, good and evil, receive the visible Sacrament of that substance God hath ordained it, which in it hath no variance, but is all one to good and evil." (In Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 202.)

Again Gardiner says—"And to all that ever this author bringeth to prove, that evil men eat not the body of Christ, may be said shortly, that *spiritually* they *eat it* NOT, besides the Sacrament, and in the Sacrament they *eat* it *not* EFFECTUALLY *to life*, but *condemnation*. And that is and MAY BE CALLED *a* NOT EATING; as they be said not to hear the Word of God, that hear it NOT PROFITABLY. . . . . For evil men eat not the body of Christ to have ANY FRUIT by it, as evil men be said not to hear God's Word to have any fruit by it." (Page 214.)

"St. Paul's words plainly import, that those did eat the very body of Christ which did eat unworthily, and therefore were guilty of the body and blood of Christ. . . . . And therefore to conclude this place with the author, 'whosoever eateth Christ's flesh and drinketh His blood, hath everlasting life,' with St. Paul's exposition, if he doth it worthily; or else by the same St. Paul, he hath condemnation." (Page 217.)

"And therefore, as good men eating Christ have salvation, so evil men eating Christ have condemnation; and so for the diversity of the eaters of Christ's body, followeth, as they be worthy or unworthy, the effect of condemnation or life; Christ's Sacrament and His work also, in the substance of that Sacrament, being always one. And whatsoever this author talketh otherwise in this matter is mere trifles." (Page 219.)

TRUTH comes in discussion, then they are "NOT TO BE USED"? (Page 215.)

(2) We have next to deal with the case of Cheney and Geste.

Cheney appears to have been a decided Lutheran, and Geste seems to have partly agreed with him (or, at any rate, to have stood with him) on the doctrine of "the Presence." It is clear that he had some leaning either to Lutheran views, or to the use of Lutheran language.

Two letters have been discovered in the State Paper Office written by Geste* to Cecil, both relating to the Articles, and both making mention of Cheney's difficulties. The letters may be seen at length in Mr. Perry's "Declaration on Kneeling," (pp. 192—204.) I give the two following extracts. The first is from a letter bearing date December 22, 1566, and is as follows—"I suppose you have heard

"Whereby St. Augustine teacheth the diverse effect to ensue of the diversity of the eating, and not of any diversity of that which is eaten, whether the good man or evil man receive the Sacrament." (Page 223.)

"In which thou, reader, seest a denial of that flesh of Christ to be given, to be eaten, that was crucified, but the flesh given to be eaten to be a Godly and spiritual flesh." (Page 232.)

Any one, I think, acquainted with the writings of the Ritualists will acknowledge that there is here sufficient to justify the assertion in the text. Let the reader study Cranmer's crushing replies to all this, let him also think of Parker's studying all this, let him also take into account Parker's opinion of Cranmer, (see above,) and then let him estimate the probability of Parker's penning the 29th Article, and its heading, in the language of Cranmer, to teach the doctrine (concerning eating and drinking) of Gardiner.

* The second letter is not signed by Geste, but it gives evidence of being written by the same hand, and is admitted by Mr. Grueber. (Reply to Dr. Heurtley, p. 37,) to be Geste's.

how the Bishop of Gloucester [Cheney] found himself grieved with the placing of this adverb *onely* in this Article, 'The body of CHRIST is given taken and eaten in the supper after an heavenly and spiritual manner onely' because it did take away the presence of CHRIST's body in the Sacrament, and privily noted me to take his part therein, and yesterday in mine absence more plainly vouched me for the same. Whereas, between him and me, I told him plainly that this word *onely* in the foresaid Article did not exclude the presence of CHRIST's body from the Sacrament, but onely the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof: For I said unto him, *though he took Christ's body in his hand, received it with his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially and carnally* as the Doctors do write, *yet did he not for all that see it, feel it, smell it, nor taste it.* And therefore I told him, I should speak against him herein, and the rather because the Article was of mine own penning. And yet I would not for all that deny thereby anything that I had spoken of the presence." (Quoted from Goode on Eucharist, Supplem., pp. 5, 6.)

The second is from a letter without date, but written, no doubt, in 1571, just after the 39 Articles had been agreed to in Convocation, and placed before Queen Elizabeth. It is as follows. . . . "Yet for all this to avoid offence and contention the word *onely* may be well left out, as not needful. My L. of Gloucester is pronounced excommunicate by my lord of Canterbury and shall be cited to answer before him, and other bishops to certain errors which he is accused to hold. I think if this word *only* were put out of the book for his sake it were the best.

It followeth in the book, But the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith.

If this word *profitably* were put hereunto in this sort, But the mean whereby the body of Christ is *profitably* received and eaten in the supper is faith, then should the occasion of this question, whether the evil do receive Christ's body in the Sacrament, because they lack faith (which riseth of the foresaid words and causeth much strife) should be quite taken away, for that hereby is not denied the *unfruitful* receiving of Christ's body without faith, but the fruitful one affirmed.

My L. grace of Canterbury is purposed to present to the Queen's Majesty the first copy of the book of Articles (to the which the most part of the bishops have subscribed) to have it authorised by her Majesty, and there is this Article.

Evil men* receive not the body of Christ, which Article is not in the printed books either in Latin or English. IF THIS ARTICLE BE CONFIRMED and AUTHORISED by the Queen's grace it will cause much business, because it is quite contrary to the Scripture and to the doctrine of the fathers, for it is certain that Judas as evil as he was did receive Christ's body, because Christ said unto him, Take, eat, this is my body." (Quoted from Goode on Eucharist, Suppl., pp. 9, 10.)

These extracts not only throw light on the views of Bishops Geste and Cheney, but also on the relation in which those

* This Article "had been accepted indeed by Convocation in 1562, but had not been suffered to appear in the printed copy of the Articles, as set forth with the assent and sanction of the Crown, some adverse influence having been brought to bear against it." (Heurtley's Remarks on Declaration, p. 26. See Lamb's Historical Account of Thirty-nine Articles, pp. 34, 35; Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., pp. 38, 39; and Bennet's Essay on Articles, pp. 233—235. Edit. 1715. Swainson, Essay on Art. 29, pp. 30, 31, note.)

views were felt to stand towards the Articles of the English Church.

Cheney felt there was for him a *crux* in the 28th Article which declares that the body and blood of Christ are received *only* after a heavenly and spiritual manner. The *crux* might be removed by the omission of the word "*only*." But Geste had, perhaps, been labouring to get the Article so worded, as at the same time to satisfy the requirements of the Bishops, and yet in language which Lutherans might (in some sense) accept. And perhaps with this view had inserted that word "only." At any rate, it appears, Geste could let the "only" remain and find in the Article no repudiation of the Lutheran Presence. In discourse therefore with Cheney he had justified the Article and the word "only," declaring that it was his own* penning.

And here we see the true wisdom, and vigilance, and care, and (in this matter) the likemindedness to Cranmer, of Archbishop Parker, in that he saw that the 28th Article with all its plain teaching would serve as an insufficient test to exclude those dangerous roots of "the Real Presence." That Article indeed declares that the body of Christ is† "given, taken, and

* Meaning probably, the alterations made in the Article in 1562, for as Dr. Heurtley has observed, "the Article itself had formed one of King Edward's Articles published ten years before." (Remarks on Declaration, p. 22.)

† This declaration also was added by Archbishop Parker; (Geste, it must be supposed, having had a hand in "*pennynge*" it somehow.) See Lamb's "Historical Account of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 14.

Strype supposes that Parker designed these words as a new Title for a separate Article. He says (in Annals, vol. i., chap. 28, anno 1562, Edit. 1725, p. 326) relating "a few things which I took notice of in the perusal of" Parker's MS. Articles of 1562 in Benet College

eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner:" and that "the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." And it is true that

Library,—"Article the 28th of the Lord's Supper, being somewhat long, the Archbishop thinking to have it divided into two, after *occasionem*, added of his own hand, this Title, that was to serve for another Article 'Corpus Christi datur, accipitur et manducatur in Cœnâ, tantùm cœlesti et spirituali ratione.' And then the Article begins 'Christus in Cœlum ascendens Corpori suo immortalitatem dedit,' etc.; but there is a red line drawn through it, as though he intended upon second thought wholly to leave it out." Art. 29th, "In the margin the Archbishop sheweth the particular place where, writing *Super Johannem*, *Tract* 26." See Strype's Parker, book iv., chap. 5, p. 320, and Hardwick on Articles, pp. 313—315.

Strype's account, however, of the two MSS. of the Articles bequeathed by Parker to Corpus Christi College, is pronounced by Lamb to be "materially incorrect." (Preface to Historical Account of Thirty-nine Articles, p. iv.) Strype considers the strokes with red minium as marking the alterations made by Parker before presenting the copy to the Upper House of Convocation.—Lamb regards the MS. before marking as exhibiting Parker's changes on the Articles of Edward, and the red minium marks as denoting changes made in the Convocation. (See pp. 13, 16, 17.)

Bennet says, "The first Period of that which is so underdrawn and cross'd viz., these words (*Corpus Christi datur accipitur* et *manducatur in cœne, tantum celesti and spirituali ratione*) was certainly written by the Archbishop himself, it being in his own hand, who found room, between the conclusion of the foregoing Paragraph, and the beginning of what the Transcriber had made a new Paragraph, viz., *Christus in cœlam*, etc., to write down the aforesaid words. With what view the Archbishop wrote them down, I can't say; but however, his own red Lead Pencil, as was before observed, has effectually dashed them out again, with much more that follows. . . . All these instances were most certainly, either alterations resolv'd on in Convocation, or the Copyer's Mistakes Corrected." (Essay on the Articles, Edit. 1715, p. 180.)

this language exactly described and was, no doubt, intended (though by Geste designed to bear a further sense) to describe, that giving* and taking and receiving which belong

Speaking of the alterations made by the Upper House of Convocation, Lamb says, "Their chief attention seems to have been directed to the twenty-eighth 'De Cœnâ Domini.' They finally agreed to strike out this clause; *Christus in cælum ascendens . . . vel credere vel profiteri.* By reference to the printed copy of the manuscript it will be seen that Parker inserted in the break left between the concluding words of the preceding sentence, '*Superstitionum dedit occasionem*' and the first words of the following, '*Christus in cælum*—,' the sentence, '*Corpus Christi datur accipitur et manducatur in cœnâ tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione.*' It might perhaps be discussed whether this clause should be the title to an article commencing with the words '*Christus in cœlum ascendens, etc.*' It was however ultimately determined to erase it; and the article concluded with the clause before introduced by Parker, 'Corpus tamen Christi datur accipitur, et manducatur in cœnâ tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione medium autem quo Corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in cœnâ fides est.'" (Pages 17, 18.)

Might it not tend, perhaps, to harmonize facts and statements, if we were to suppose that the insertion "in the break" of "Corpus Christi, etc." (as well as the marking out "Christus in cœlum," etc., etc.) was made at one of the secret meetings of the Bishops (of which we have mention in the *Synodalia*. See Cardwell, vol. ii., pp. 505, 509, 510, 512): and that the insertion was made at the suggestion of Geste, and subsequently enlarged and set at the end—as a *substitute* for the expunged passage? Thus Geste would think to obtain a concession in the removal of an obnoxious declaration, while satisfying the other Bishops by the introduction of a statement which by others might be thought equivalent, but which, in his own sense, Geste could subscribe. This supposition, however, would not be altogether without its difficulties.

* See Appendix, Note D.

to the actings of the soul* corresponding, in things spiritual and unseen, to the sacramental actions in things outward and visible. But from another point of view they might possibly be accepted by Lutherans. They might possibly be made to endure the pressure which would force a Lutheran sense into them. They might be accepted even by Geste as signifying that the Presence, though conveyed in the Elements, was not cognizable by the senses of the body. If this Article had stood alone, Cheney would have desired, and Geste would have preferred, the word "*only*"† omitted, but Geste could have signed it; and Cheney with Geste's explanation might *possibly* have been brought to accept it too.

There needed something more, there needed something more testing yet, to exclude the Real Presence in Luther's sense. And that something Parker desired to supply. And though difficulties and hindrances were set in his way,

* The following is the argument of Ursinus from the manner of reception, "Ait, esse modum cœlestem. Atqui IN CŒLO *non manducatur ore corporis:* et Corpus Christi versatur ibi tantum visibiliter, palpabiliter, circumscripte et localiter, neque ingreditur aut existit intra hominum corpora. *Si ergo* CŒLESTIS *est iste præsentiæ et manducationis modus*, non est *oralis*, neque impiis communis." (Consideratio Commonefactionis Chytræi, in Works of Ursinus, vol. ii., p. 1180, Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

† It may be observed that the "*tantum*" of Geste's penning was directly contradictory to strict Lutheran language, as will be seen by the following extract from the Formula Concordiæ. "Credimus, docemus, et confitemur, corpus et sanguinem Christi *non tantum* Spiritualiter per fidem, sed etiam ore, non tamen Capernaitice, set supernaturali, et cœlesti modo, ratione Sacramentalis unionis, cum pane et vino sumi." ("De Cœna Dom." *Affirm.*, vi., p. 600 of "Concordia. Pia et unanimi consensu, etc." Lepsiæ, 1654.)

yet he carried his point, and the 29th Article, which had previously in 1562 been accepted by Convocation, was added to our Articles for avoiding diversities of opinion. And even Geste was now made to feel that a test was applied, which his views, or Cheney's at least, could not stand.*

Now, at least, he was constrained to acknowledge, that there was insuperable repugnance between Lutheran views and the declared doctrines of our Church.

It appears then to me to be, for them, a most unfortunate argument, which has been built on the letters of Geste, by those who maintain the Real Objective Presence. If we had not the 29th Article, and if we had only Geste's first letter to Cheney, it might have stood them in good stead. It might have served to show that a mind such as Geste's could find room for Lutherans to sit down on, even in the language of an Article, which to most ears would sound against them.

* Mr. Perry's argument (in "Declaration on Kneeling," p. 205, sqq.)—appears to me to rest on the assumption, that, if Article 28 was open to two interpretations, Article 29 must needs be so also.

It is surely sufficient answer to observe that Geste himself *did* not, because he evidently *could* not, so understand it.

Mr. Perry says "It is enough surely for those who hold the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, to be able to maintain—that they are entitled to hold and teach that doctrine because the terms of the Article (28th) do 'not exclude' it, and that this is affirmed by the Bishop who drew up the Article." (Page 205.) I happen to have in my possession Dean Goode's own copy of Mr. Perry's work.

And, I think, I cannot do better, than put down by way of answer, what I find written here in the margin by Dean Goode,—"I have shewn that Geste's object was not gained, because another Article was introduced *contrary* to the meaning he affixed to those words; and therefore a subscriber to the Articles cannot fairly interpret the words in that sense."

But as it is, we have another letter from Geste which refers to Article the 29th; and from this it appears, that one who in that day seems to have had the very same tendency as our modern Ritualists, to strain every cord to the uttermost to make room for Lutheran views, felt that now he was overmatched by the wisdom and foresight of Parker—that even he, who could justify the "only" in Article 28th,* can do nothing now but strongly condemn

* The 28th Article declared that the body and blood of Christ are given, taken, and received only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and that the mean whereby the body and blood of Christ are received and eaten in the supper is faith.

How strongly the NATURAL language of Lutheran doctrine stands in contrast with this, may be seen by comparing the words of the Lutheran formula quoted above, p. 670, note.

It will be observed that the Lutheran Article distinctly *denies*, and that the English Article as distinctly *asserts*, the reception of the ***Res sacramenti*** after a *spiritual manner* ONLY.

The same Lutheran Formula condemns the assertion—"Corpus Christi in Sacra Cœna non ore una cum pane sumi: sed tantum panem et vinum ore accepi: corpus vero Christi spiritualiter duntaxat, fide nimirum, sumi." (See Goode on Euch. ii., p. 648.)

The words of the Article must have been supposed by Parker to convey obviously the anti-Lutheran sense, if it were his first design (as Strype thinks), or the first design of the upper house of Convocation, to make these words to be the heading of a new Article, which should embody the statement which before formed the conclusion of this Article. It must be obvious, I think, that in Geste's sense the words so employed would be quite out of place.

If this design has been carried out, the Lutheran "Real Presence" would, no doubt, have been in *words* more distinctly condemned. Humphrey and Sampson, therefore, disapproved the change. (Zur. Letters, i., p. 165.) But it would appear probable that Convocation, after mature consideration, preferred relying upon statements which would serve as effectual tests of doctrine, while avoiding the condemnation of the phrase "Real Presence." (See Lamb's Historical

the language of Article 29th, because it is too evident, that that Article speaks language which quite unmistakeably condemns the "Real Presence" of Luther. Geste would not repudiate one word in Article 28; he would claim it all his own, because he would not see his own views, or the views he desired to shelter, repudiated by it.

He rejects and repudiates entirely the teaching of Article 29, because it is plain that he *must* see that the doctrine of the Lutherans is rejected and repudiated by *that*.*

Agreement there might be, though some might think it a very forced agreement, between Lutheran views and the words of the 28th Article. But between such views and the words of the 29th Article no agreement could ever be forced.

And I do not see how we could find, or desire to find, stronger evidence than is furnished by Geste's second letter, to the fact—not only that in the theological language of the Reformation the 29th Article *did* NOT *naturally* mean, but also that it *could not* in that language anyhow be *forced into meaning* that which some modern theologians would constrain it to mean.†

Account of Thirty-nine Articles, pp. 15—18; and Copy, No. ii., pp. 12—13; and Burnet's History of Reformation, vol. i., p. 583, Edit. Orr, 1850.)

It may be added, that the words of the 28th Article must have been understood (as it seems to me) by the Bishops at the Savoy Conference in their natural anti-Lutheran sense; since they gave it as a reason for the needlessness of the Black Rubric, that its sense was "sufficiently declared in the 28th Article." (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 354.)

* See Appendix, Note E.

† Will any one, after reading Geste's second letter, maintain that in the theological language of the time the Article did *not* speak to,

Bishop Geste asks* to have a word inserted in Article 28, that it may not appear to deny reception by the wicked. How clearly does this show that the moot question, in its testing character, is being dealt with! But what does he get in answer to his request? That one word inserted? No. But, instead, an Article *is* inserted, which, by his own shewing, positively and distinctly *states* that very denial which the insertion of that word might (as he hoped) have taken out of the other.†

and did not speak distinctly and decidedly about that *moot* question (the reception by unbelievers,) which was felt to be so important and so testing?

If not, the whole controversy as to the meaning of the 29th Article is at an end. And then, not only so, but then surely the whole controversy as to the doctrine of the English Church ought to be regarded as at an end also. For here the Church of England has *spoken to* the testing question, and that in a *separate* Article, and in an Article *added on purpose*, and added to Articles *made for the purpose* of "avoiding of diversities of opinions."

* I have said nothing in the text of Geste's suggestion for inserting "in dede." It is (in substance) not only in the place quoted from Jewel, but also in Hooper, (see Paper No. VI., p. 321,) and in Nowell's smaller Catechism. (Ibid., p. 306.) Its insertion would have been perfectly unobjectionable, and would have added nothing to the true meaning of the Article. The rejection of this suggestion was but the rejection of an *emphasis*. But, inasmuch as this emphasis was desired by Geste in the interest of Lutheran views or Lutheran language, it may perhaps be right to observe, that even non-compliance with this very innocent request was added to the rejection of every other suggestion he made. Geste's discomfiture, in the matter he was aiming at, was a *complete* discomfiture.

† "We see from Bishop Geste's own letter that he clearly saw that for the maintenance of his doctrine, that evil men receive the body of Christ, it was necessary that in the statement of the 28th Article, that 'the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in

(3) It only remains for me now to deal with the alle-

the Supper is faith,' the word 'profitably' should be inserted before 'received,' and he proposed the addition, and complained that Archbishop Parker had sought to obtain the sanction of the Queen to an Article, to which 'the most part' of the Bishops had subscribed, stating that 'evil men receive not the Body of Christ.' But when the Articles appear, with the Queen's authority, the Article thus sanctioned by Parker and the subscribing Bishops is among them, and the word 'profitably' not added to the 28th. Can there be a clearer proof of the opposition of Parker and the subscribing Bishops to Geste's views, and of the meaning intended to be conveyed by the Articles? If Bishop Geste really wrote the whole of the 28th Article with the view of drawing up a statement which should express both his own doctrine and that of the majority of the Bishops, it is clear that he attempted to do what was impossible. And the result was, that while he was compelled to word it so as to express the doctrine of the majority of the Bishops, he was obliged to leave himself only a non-natural construction to fall back upon in his defence. And when a revision of the Articles was in hand, and one openly and directly opposing his doctrine was about to be added, he applied to the Prime Minister to get the additional Article rejected, and his own wording of the 28th altered so as to express his doctrine, but without success." (Goode, II., Supplement, pp. 26, 27.)

Mr. Perry says—"The *non-insertion* of this word [*profitably*] is no proof that it was *rejected*." (On Declaration concerning Kneeling, p. 214.) Perhaps not, if this particular point were regarded alone, though it would afford some strong presumption against the approval of Geste's views. But viewed in connexion with the failure of all Geste's proposals, and the insertion of the Article he so strongly deprecated, the design of the *non-insertion* can hardly be mistaken, and its doctrinal importance can hardly be set aside.

The fact too of Geste's thus appealing to the interference of the State authority (by which the 29th Article had apparently been suppressed in 1562) seems to indicate (as well as his reference to the other Bishops, and particularly Parker) that he felt that his views had to meet the powerful opposition of the Episcopate, and that his only hope was in influencing Cecil.

gation—that the Article *cannot mean* to say that unbelievers do not eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood, because the Article cites the authority of St. Augustine, and St. Augustine* believed that evil men do, in the Sacrament, eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood.

To enter into a critical examination of St. Augustine's teaching on the subject of the Eucharist, would lead to a long digression, and one quite unnecessary for our present purpose.

There is reason to think that his writings† on this

* "The Article must then be explained according to St. Augustine's meaning, as it relies on his authority alone . . . . or we must say with respect to this Article, as Bellarmine does upon St. Augustine, that the wicked receive not the Lord, that is, as the Lord." (Sancta Clara, Lee's Edit., p. 67. See Pusey's "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," p. 259, sqq.; and Forbes on Articles, II., p. 581, sqq.; Denison, as quoted in Goode on Eucharist, II., p. 659; Grueber's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1856, pp. 5—10; and Reply to Dr. Heurtley, p. 41.)

It is scarcely necessary to point out the mistake of Sancta Clara. When the reference to St. Augustine stood in the margin, the Article might (perhaps) be said to *rely* on his authority, though not on that "alone." But there is now no such reference, and the Article simply adopts St. Augustine's words: and it is but of secondary importance whether the framers were careful about using them in St. Augustine's sense—though, in point of fact, they did use them in his sense.

† See Goode on Eucharist, I., pp. 350—365, and II., pp. 659—664, also (for further evidence as to St. Augustine's views) I., pp. 250—255. "An examination of the additions will show at once, that they were made with a view to make the passage *capable of an interpretation* suitable to the then received doctrine. . . . . As both the Archdeacons (eager to get a supposed argument against Article xxix.) contend that the words in brackets are not Augustine's, (and in that I agree with them), I suppose we may conclude that the passage is to stand here denuded of these additions; and I ask the reader whether we could wish for a passage more expressly limiting the EATING—not

subject have been tampered with, and their sense twisted and turned by interpolation, as ancient writings have too often been tampered with, that they may be brought into harmony with modern Romish developments of doctrine.

Any, indeed, who may be disposed to take it for granted that St. Augustine *did* hold that evil men really receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, may be asked to read what Bishop Morton* and Bishop Jeremy Taylor

merely the *worthy* eating, or the *spiritual* eating, but the EATING AT ALL—of the body of Christ to those that dwell in Christ, and in whom Christ dwells?" (pp. 356—7.) The passage from St. Augustine thus cleared, reads thus: "He that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, beyond doubt NEITHER EATS *His flesh*, NOR DRINKS His blood; although he eat and drink to his condemnation the Sacrament of so great a thing."

* I will put down here the headings of certain sections in Bishop Morton's work on the Eucharist, which in connexion with this subject may be specially commended to the consideration of the reader.

Book v., chap. 2, sect. 1. "That only the *godly-faithful* communicants are partakers of the *body and blood of Christ;* and thereby united to Christ; in the judgment of Protestants."

Ibid., sec. 4. "That the *wicked receivers* are called *guilty of Christ's body*, not by properly eating of His body unworthily, but for unworthily eating the Sacrament thereof *symbolically*."

Ibid, sec. 7. "That only the *godly Christians* are partakers of the body and blood of Christ, and thereby *united* unto Him, is NOT *contrary* to the judgment of ancient Fathers, as is objected."

Ibid, sec. 8. "That the ungodly do not communicate of Christ's body in receiving the Eucharist, is the determinate judgment of antiquity, and consequently argueth a No-Corporal *presence* of Christ, as an *union* with him in the Eucharist."

Ibid, sec. 9. "That Saint Augustine, *(to whom both sides appeal)*, is a DIRECT PATRON of our PROTESTANT CAUSE, for proof, that the wicked EAT NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST; and consequently an adversary to the Romish faith of a *Corporal Presence* in this Sacrament; noting also an egregious depravation of a testimony of Saint Augustine, by a Romish doctor."

have written on this subject, before they allow themselves to come to any such conclusion.

But even suppose the very contrary to be proved, or

Ibid, sec. 10. "A vindication of a special testimony of *Saint* Augustine, in the same point, against the notorious falsifications of his word, by Doctor Hoskins."

Book v., chap. 3, sec. 2. "Proving the objected *Saint Augustine* to contradict the Romish doctrine of *Corporal Presence*, AS PROTESTANTLY *as can be*."

Bishop Jeremy Taylor's writing on the subject will be found in "Real Presence." (Sec. vii. 9, vol. vi., pp. 71—3.) The following brief extracts may be acceptable. "S. Austin . . . (1) dogmatically declares that the wicked man *does* NOT EAT Christ's body truly. (2) he DOES EAT it *Sacramentally*. (3) that to eat with effect, is to eat Christ's body truly; to which if they please to add this, that to eat it spiritually is to eat it with effect, it follows by S. Austin's doctrine that *spiritually* is *really*, and that there is no true and real body of Christ eaten in the Sacrament but by the faithful receiver. . . . . Neither can this be put off with saying that the wicked do not *truly* eat Christ, that is, not to any benefit or purpose, but that this does not mean they receive Him not at all. . . . . Because S. Austin opposes *sacramental* receiving to the *true* and *real* . . . he says they do NOT AT ALL receive Him TRULY . . . . and he proves this by unanswerable arguments out of Scripture. . . . . He calls that which the wicked eat *nothing but* SIGNUM *Corporis et sanguinis*."

See also J. Patrick, on Transubstantiation, chap. xiii. in Gibson's Preservative, vol. ix., p. 231, sqq., also the quotation from St. Augustine in p. 230. The title of chap. xiii. is "The Fathers assert that the faithful only eat Christ's body, and drink his blood in the Eucharist, not the wicked. Whereas they of the present Roman Church extend it to both." Quotations from Augustine will be found in pp. 235—237. See also pp. 44—48, and Gardiner's Examination of Roman Catholic Faith, in vol. xiv., pp. 284—5. See also Archbishop Ussher's Works, vol. iii., pp. 60—62, and the conclusions of Albertin "out of St. Austin's works," in Bingham, Book xv., chap. 5, § 5. Vol. v., pp. 254, 255. See also Hospinian; Historia Sacramentaria, Pars i., Liber ii., in Works, vol. iii., p. 72, sqq., especially

suppose that modern criticism should lead decisively to the conclusion that many of the *words* quoted in the Article are

pp. 87, 88, 89; Geneva, 1681. And Calvin's works, vol. viii., p. 690, sqq., especially p. 692; Amsterdam, 1667.

Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, makes a concession with regard to *some* passages of St. Augustine's writings. Speaking of the reception of the *res sacramenti* by the wicked, he says, "the great voice of antiquity, with *the exception of* SOME *passages in St. Augustine*, supports this view." (On Articles, Vol. ii., p. 574. See p. 582, sqq.)

Mr. Cary says, "Augustine's testimony is as clear as possible, not only in the place referred to by the Article, but also in many others." (Testimonies of the Fathers, p. 337.)

Admitting that there are to be found in the writings of St. Augustine two classes of passages, one very distinctly denying the reception of the *res sacramenti* by the wicked, the other seeming to speak a different language, the reader may be asked to consider (1,) which of these two classes is most likely to contain interpolations. (See Goode, on Eucharist i., pp. 357—361; ii. 664—660.) (2,) which of these two classes is most likely to contain such passages as may be called *testing* passages, or passages which may be regarded as true tests of St. Augustine's doctrine. (See note on No. 3, p. 154, sqq., and especially the words there quoted from Archbishop Longley.) Surely to such passages as seem to speak of the reception of the *res Sacramenti* by the wicked, it is but fair to apply St. Augustine's own rule of interpretation—that the Sacrament of Christ's body is called Christ's body, because sacraments have the name of the things of which they are sacraments. (See Cranmer on Lord's Supper, pp. 104, 224, 225, 281. Ridley's Works, pp. 40, 41. Hutchinson's Works, p. 56. Bradford's Sermons, pp. 87, 88, 533. Sandys's Sermons, pp. 453—4 notes. Whitgift's Works, iii., pp. 111, 112. J. Patrick in Gibson's Preservative, vol ix., p. 142, etc., etc. Goode on Eucharist, I., pp. 513—4, 516—7, 262—3, 359, 362, 364.)

But where is the key that can (without forcible straining) be so applied to the interpretation of the other class of passages, as to make them speak of any *real* reception by the ungodly?

There is also a further consideration not without its weight in

not really St. Augustine's at all: * still the doctrine of our Article would remain untouched and unshaken by any such discoveries.

By all means, let the question of St. Augustine's opinions of this subject be argued fairly, and sifted thoroughly. We acknowledge the importance of the issue in its relation to the Eucharistic controversy, in that branch of it which is concerned with the views of the ancient Fathers. If it can be shewn, let it be shewn, that St. Augustine has been altogether misrepresented. We do not fear the result of the enquiry, if only St. Augustine be allowed to be the interpreter of his own language.

determining St. Augustine's true meaning in doubtful passages. I mean his bearing witness to the truth that the body in which Christ rose must be in *one* place. (See Bradford's Sermons, pp. 90, 91, and notes. Ridley's Works, pp. 176, 215, 216. Cranmer on Lord's Supper, pp. 140, 141. Grindal's Remains, p. 53. Hooper's Early Writings, pp. 192—194. Jewel, Apol. and Defence, pp. 253, 254, 257, 258, 259, etc. etc, Bishop Stillingfleet in Gibson's Preservative, vol. ix., p. 311, sqq., and J. Patrick in vol. ix., p. 169, sqq. Goode on Eucharist i., pp. 298—301, 309—312, 503.

The application of St. Augustine's teaching on this matter to the subject of the Eucharistic presence, is forcibly expressed in the following passage:—

"Quanto minus a communione Eucharistiæ plurium locorum substantialis illa sub pane veri corporis Christi præsentia probari aut constare potest, si ne phentasmaticum quidem illud Manichæi, quod Christo tribuebat, corpus, simul totum in sole, et lunâ, in arboribus, et herbis esse possit, sed alium subinde atque alium Christum corporali ista præsentia esse, fierique oporteat?" (Consensus Orthodoxus. Edit. 1605, p. 199. See also Bishop Bilson's True Difference, pp. 786—791.)

* Which Dean Goode admits to be the case. (See On Eucharist, ii., p. 660.) The *statement*, however, is, no doubt, *substantially* St. Augustine's. See above, pp. 676, 677.

But as regards the question which is before us—the interpretation of our Article—it is plain that we are concerned, not with the doctrine of St. Augustine, but with the doctrine his words are alleged as supporting, or illustrating.

It will not anyways affect the sense of our Article, if any theologian of the English Church should now say, "I am persuaded that it is a mistake to suppose that St. Augustine's views stand opposed to the corporal presence and the oral manducation, and I am prepared to argue the matter; and I think I can make it appear that St. Augustine rather supports than opposes such a view." Even supposing for a moment such a theologian to enter the lists, and to come out of the controversy victorious in the estimation of all; yet the sense of our Article would be untouched by the result. To affect the interpretation of the Article, it must be shown, not only what St. Augustine's views are, but that at the time of the Reformation they were universally felt, and by all confessed, to be clearly and unmistakeably against what we contend for as the natural meaning of our Article. If this could be shown, we should at once acknowledge the serious damage it would inflict on our arguments. But, so long as it is notorious, that the claim to the authority of St. Augustine was set up by the Reformed as declaring for them in opposition to the views of Papists and Lutherans alike—so long as it is a matter of history that this claim, however hotly disputed by some, was (in a kindred point of the controversy *) frankly conceded by Luther himself—so

* It may perhaps be considered fairly open to question, whether Luther's concession of Augustine and Fulgentius was to be understood in relation to the whole matter of controversy with Zuingle and Œcolampadius, or only to the particular point on which their authority was then being pressed.

long it will be vain to aim at overthrowing the sense of our Article by new investigations of the writings of St. Augustine.

To look at the matter only and exclusively from an English point of view, it must be clear—and, indeed, it is fair to state that it is admitted by some of our strongest opponents—that what is essential in this enquiry is not what St. Augustine may have meant, but what our Reformers meant—"not what St. Augustine taught, but in what sense the framers of the Article have adopted [or rather moulded] his words as expository of the doctrine of the Church of England." *

So that in order, in any degree, to shake our arguments as to the natural sense of the Article, it must be shown, not only (if it can be shown) that St. Augustine's teaching does not support the doctrine contained in the natural sense of the Article, but that our English Reformers did not so understand St. Augustine's teaching.

Let THIS be shewn, and we will admit the force of the argument.

If, however, it be supposed to be confined to that one point, it must be noted that *that* point was not simply Christ's corporal presence *having a locality in heaven*, but rather the consequent impossibility of His being, *in corporal presence*, at the same time in any other place. ["Zwinglius ex Fulgentio legit, quod Christus sit *in uno loco*." Again: "Augustinus dicit, in *uno loco* esse oportet." Hospinian, Hist. Sacrament; in Works, vol. iv., p. 126; Geneva, 1681. See Goode on Eucharist, i., pp. 301, 309, 311, 314, 315.]

But if this be so, it will scarcely be denied that all teaching of *re vera* oral reception, and therefore all *real reception* by the wicked, must needs also be *excluded* from St. Augustine's teaching, and his authority on these points be *included* in Luther's concession.

* Denison, quoted in Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 664.

But THIS, so far as I know, none have attempted to shew. And very sure I am, that if any attempt had been made, it would have proved a void and fruitless attempt indeed.

The consensus of our Reformers in denying the reception of the *res sacramenti* by the wicked and unbelievers, is most striking and most significant. We may surely be thankful for the conclusive evidence it affords of the determinate and distinctive character of our English Reformation, under the application of such a decisive test of the doctrine of the Eucharistic presence.

But if *this* is a striking feature in the writings of our Reformers, not less striking is the continual recurrence of an appeal to St. Augustine,* and an appeal for this very purpose — that St. Augustine may bear witness to the doctrine they maintained—the denial of the wicked participating at all, or receiving and eating at all—in any *real* sense—the thing signified by the outward sign or sacrament which they eat to their condemnation.

* Not unfrequently to the sentences of Prosper also. And this will be sufficient answer to Dr. Pusey's argument, from the fact of Parker's referring to Prosper in his letter to Lord Burleigh. (See Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 275—277.) See Hutchinson, Works, p. 265; Becon, Catechism, etc., p. 292; Becon, Prayers, etc., pp. 433-4 and 463 (see Editor's note 16), and 464: Grindal's Remains, p. 59.

Hutchinson says—"Paul speaketh there of unworthy receivers, which do not eat Christ's body, which is the bread of life, but the only figure and sacrament thereof; and they do eat the said *only* sacrament and *only* figure to their judgment and condemnation, as I have proved. This is not my doctrine, but the doctrine of Hierome, of Ambrose, of St. Austin, of PROSPER, and of Bede, as is declared in the beginning of this lesson." (Hutchinson's Works, p. 280.) See also Archbishop Ussher, Works, vol. iii., p. 61; Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 663-4.

Of the many examples of this, one—instar omnium—shall be set down here, because it is the testimony of Bishop* Jewel, who not only was a member of the Convocation (1562) in which the Article was framed, but had himself to do with finally reviewing and publishing the Article we are considering.

"To come near to the purpose, St. Augustine saith: 'Outwardly they have the Sacrament of Christ's body; but the thing itself (which is Christ's body represented by the Sacrament) inwardly in their hearts they have not. And, therefore, they eat and drink their own judgment.' Here

* "As Bishop Jewel was not only an Episcopal member of the Convocation in 1571, in which this Article was added, but actually had the final revision of the Articles before publication committed to him, his judgment on the meaning of this passage is of primary importance; and it will be observed that he quotes it precisely as it stands in the Article, in that form which, it is contended, cannot mean what we attribute to it." (Goode on Eucharist, II., pp. 810, 811.) It should be observed, however, that Jewel's citation retains the word "spiritually" which the Article, so significantly, rejects.

He (Jewel) "attended that Parliament, and the Convocation in which the Articles were again revised; and it was determined, May 4, that 'when the book of Articles touching doctrine should be fully agreed upon, then the same should be put in print by the order and direction of the Bishop of Sarum,' (*i.e.*, Jewel). This accordingly was done; so that he may justly be said to have set the *finishing hand* to our present Articles." (Biographical Memoir of Jewel, in P. S. Edit., xx. See Strype's Parker, book iv., chap. 5, p. 319.)

"Thus was the finishing hand put by Jewel in 1571 to the Articles of our Faith, which were first promulgated by Cranmer in 1553. During this period they had been carefully revised and altered (as it has been shewn) by Parker; and examined and confirmed by no less than five-and-twenty Bishops, a body of divines which was never equalled at any period of the Christian Church, in Biblical learning, Divine knowledge, and practical Godliness." (Lamb's Historical Account of Thirty-Nine Articles, p. 32.)

St. Augustine saith, they are guilty, not because they receive, but because they receive not the body of Christ. Mark well these words, M. Harding: they are effectual. The wicked, by St. Augustine's judgment, are guilty, not because they receive, but because they receive not the body of Christ.

Again he (*i.e.*, St. Augustine) saith: 'Whoso abideth not in Christ, nor Christ in him, out of doubt he eateth not spiritually His flesh, nor drinketh His blood; notwithstanding carnally (that is to say, with the bodily mouth) and visibly he do press with his teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; and rather eateth and drinketh (*not Christ's very body and blood, but*) the Sacrament of so great a thing, unto his judgment.' These words, M. Harding, be *so plain, that I cannot imagine what ye should more desire.* They are guilty of the blood of Christ, for that they despise the price wherewith they were saved, not for that they receive it really into their mouth." (Defence of Apology, P.S. Edit., pp. 894, 895.)

Again: "You may not negligently pass over these words, M. Harding: St. Augustine saith plainly: 'The THING itself that is represented by the Sacrament (that is to say, THE VERY BODY OF CHRIST) is *received* of ALL MEN TO LIFE, and of NO MAN TO DESTRUCTION, whosoever shall be partaker of it.' Hereof you must needs conclude against yourself, that the WICKED *receive* NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST." (Ibid., p. 895.)

If need were, many* other examples might be adduced of the oft-recurring use which our Reformers made of this testimony of St. Augustine—to the doctrine they so constantly maintained, and which, with a fair light fairly

* See Appendix, Note F.

thrown upon it from their writings, it is, I maintain, absolutely impossible for us to doubt, they have embodied in the words and language (so exactly in harmony with their own words and language) of the 29th Article, which has for its title, "Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," and which has for its declaration that "The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint *Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

Thus, then, I have completed (however imperfectly) the work which I set before me, in entering upon this series of Papers.

It might, indeed, have very well come into my subject to consider the Thirty-first Article, in reference to that Sacrificial teaching which forms a branch of the "Real Objective" Doctrine.

But that portion of the subject is wide enough, and important enough, to demand for itself a separate consideration.

I trust it may be undertaken by some pen more competent and better furnished for such a task than my own.

I have only to add here, that it has been no part of my desire or intention to exalt any particular view of the mode of the Eucharistic Presence, or the repudiation of any other

view, into the position of an Article of the Faith.* I have only desired to shew—and I certainly believe that I have

* It must not be forgotten, that to give room, or to find room in the Church of England, for the teaching of the Real Objective Presence (as it is taught by those who hold it as *de fide*) is to find room for the teaching of that, *which* TO BE TRUE TO ITSELF, *must* be willing to allow room for no other doctrine to be either taught or held on the subject, which *must* seek to cast out what has been the teaching of the English Reformed Church for three hundred years, which *must* not only brand as heretics Cranmer and all our Reformers, but *must* also put on its *Index* the writings of Hooker,* and Morton, and Jeremy Taylor, and of our great English Theologians generally, which *must* seek to shut the mouth of every Minister of the Gospel, who desires to speak as our Reformers spake, and to teach the truth as our Reformers taught it; nay, more, which *must* desire, for the minds and hearts of *all the members* of the Church, to bar the admission of that belief, which is embodied in our Articles, and which we have received as a sacred deposit from the hands of our fathers, and (must I not add?) from the fires of our Martyrs.

To say this is to accuse our opponents of no want of charity. It is to charge them with no *desire to be* intolerant. Their principles *require* this of them. Professing what they profess, they could not do otherwise without being inconsistent with their profession. Believing as they believe, it would be a want of real charity in them to do otherwise.

If the doctrine comes in, it must (in its nature) *come in to stamp out* (as I believe) every spark of that light of Protestant Truth which our dying Reformers trusted would never again be put out in England.

* Notwithstanding what has been said against my statement concerning Hooker in No. III., p. 142, note, it will be acknowledged, I can hardly doubt, by all who will read carefully Book v., ch. lxvii., pp. 348—362 (Edit. Keble), that Hooker certainly *does* take his own stand among that *third* class, whom he speaks of as *termed* Sacramentaries, and whose doctrinal position he (so firmly and ably, and yet withal so calmly and temperately) defends.

I can but ask of those who may be disposed to question this, to read and judge for themselves.

shewn—that the Church of England has of set purpose rejected from her teaching, a Doctrine which I conceive to tend to superstition and delusion, and that, therefore, she has a just right to expect her Ministers not to teach—much more to teach as *de fide*—the dogma she has carefully eliminated from her Service-Book, and deliberately denied in her Articles.

Perhaps I ought to make some apology for a very long list of *Errata*, as well as, probably, for other inaccuracies or errors which may have escaped detection. Though I ask for no justification, I am sure I may ask for some allowance to be made for these, by those who know anything of the difficulties attending a work of this sort in the midst of the constant encroachments on the limited leisure of one actively engaged in Parochial duty.

Let me conclude by asking forgiveness (in all sincerity) of any whom, in this controversy, I may unwittingly have injured or offended—beseeching for myself and for my opponents pardoning mercy and enlightening grace, of Him, who giveth to all richly and upbraideth not, and through Him alone, whose Flesh is meat indeed, and whose Blood is drink indeed.

APPENDIX.

Note A, p. 604.

If it be asked in what sense our English Reformers adopted this word "effectual" (efficacia) as applied to the sacramental signs, it might suffice to refer to the quotations made in the fifth Paper of this series as justifying the language of our Homily, (p. 269, sqq.) But it may be useful to illustrate the use of the word by the following extract from an important and interesting letter written by Peter Martyr, from Oxford (where he was Regius Professor of Divinity) June 14, 1552, between the time of the completion of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., and the setting forth of the 42 Articles. "Things remain to a great extent as they were before, except that the Book or Order of Ecclesiastical Rites and the Administration of the Sacraments has been reformed, for all things have been removed from it which could nourish superstition. But the chief reason, that prevented the other things which were purposed from being effected, was the matter of the sacraments: not truly as far as regards transubstantiation, or the real presence (so to speak), either in the bread or in the wine: since, thanks be to God, concerning these things there seems to be now no controversy as it regards those who profess the gospel; but, whether grace is conferred by virtue of the sacraments, is a point about which many have hesitated. And there have been some who have altogether affirmed that doctrine, and were desirous that a decision should be given to that effect. Concerning which, because others clearly saw how many superstitions that sentence would bring with it, they endeavoured at first in all ways to show, that nothing more is to be granted to the sacraments than to the external word of God: for by both these kinds of word is signified or shown the salvation obtained for us through Christ, of which as many are made partakers as believe these words and signs, not indeed by the power of the words or sacraments, but by the efficacy of

faith. Moreover it was added, that it was impossible that the sacraments should be worthily received unless the recipients have beforehand that which is signified by them; for without faith they were always taken unworthily: but, if they who come to the sacraments are endued with faith, they have already through faith laid hold upon the grace which is proclaimed to us in the sacraments; the after reception and use of which is the seal and obsignation of the promise already received. And, as the external words of God avail to the awakening and arousing faith, often torpid, and in a manner laid asleep in us, this same thing also the sacraments can effect by the power of the Holy Spirit, and their use is not of little benefit to confirm our minds, otherwise weak, concerning the promises and grace of God." (P. Martyr's Letter to Bullinger, June 14, 1552, in Bradford's Works. P. S. Edit., ii., pp. 403-4.)

In this letter there are three things specially deserving of attention.

(1) Martyr's testimony that all things had been removed from the Prayer Book that could nourish superstition.

(2) His testimony that "THE REAL PRESENCE" was, at that time, *out of* the controversy.

(3) That as to the matter which was *in* controversy (whether or not sacraments ought to be said to *confer grace*) those who took the *lowest view*, spoke of what "*the sacraments* (*facere possunt*) *can* EFFECT" (*i.e.* in other words spoke of them as EFFECTUAL *signs*) "by the power of the Holy Spirit": just as our Article says "whereby *He* (God) doth work invisibly in us (*in nobis operatur.*)" And so at the conclusion of the Article the Latin words "salutarem effectum habent" are rendered in the English "have a wholesome *effect* or *operation*." "He [Christ]" says Cranmer (from whose pen the words in the Article probably came) "is EFFECTUALLY *present*, and EFFECTUALLY *worketh*, not in the bread and wine, but in the godly receivers of them, to whom He giveth His own flesh spiritually to feed up, and His own blood to quench their great inward thirst." (On Lord's Supper, pp. 34, 35.)

Hooker says "We take not Baptism nor the Eucharist for bare *resemblances* or memorials of things absent, neither for NAKED SIGNS and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for *means* EFFECTUAL whereby GOD when we

take the sacraments *delivereth* into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify." (Vol. ii., Edit. Keble, p. 258.)

It must not be supposed that the phrase which Martyr objects to "conferre gratiam," and its equivalents, as applied to the sacraments, was by any means the *property* of Lutherans. (See Hardwick's Reformation, p. 246, and note 4, and on Articles, pp. 392, 94, 95.) The expression (or something similar) is used by—

(1) Bishop Hooper (Later Writings, p. 45, "such signs as do *exhibit and* GIVE the thing that they signify indeed.") (See Hardwick's Reformation, p. 219, note 5.)

(2) Bradford, who speaks of the sacraments as "signs which do . . . confirm, and seal up, or (as a man may say) *give* with their signification." (Sermons, etc., p. 94.)

(3) Archbishop Parker (Heads of Religion, 1560, in Strype's Annals, vol. i., p. 216, Edit. 1725, "duo Sacramenta . . . . quibus confertur Gratia ritè sumentibus, etiamsi malus sit Minister.") (See Hardwick's Reformation, p. 219, note 5.)

(4) Dr. Ward, delegate at the Synod of Dort, ("Sacramenta ista, quæ signa *efficacia* appellat articulus noster xxiv., *conferre* gratiam dicimus," quoted by Hardwick on Articles, p. 392.)

Dr. Ward supports his language by reference to

(5) Hooker, whose teaching may well be said to justify the appeal (see Dr. Ward's letters in Ussher's Works, Edit. Dublin, 1847, vol. xv., pp. 506, 510, referred to by Hardwick); and

(6) Calvin ("non objecto inani aut vacuo signo, sed efficaciam sui illic proferens, quâ impleat quod promittet. Et sane rem illic signatam *offert* et exhibet," etc. Instit., lib. iv., cap. 17, sec. 10, 11.)

(7) Beza, (who says "obsignari non potest quod non habetur," quoted by Ward in Ussher's Works, vol. xv., p. 511.)

(8) Ursinus (saying "Sacramentum est opus Dei erga nos, in quo dat aliquid scilicet signa et res signatas, et in quo testatur et se nobis offere ac dare sua beneficia." Also quoted by Ward as above.)

But the Heads of Doctrine of 1560 do not carry only the authority

of Archbishop Parker. They also (according to Strype, Annals, vol. i., p. 213, Edit. 1725) had the sanction of

(9) Bishop Cox, by whose pen the "Interpretations" to which they belong are supposed to have been framed, and

(10) "The Bishops" generally, by whom, (in conjunction with the Archbishop) these "Interpretations" were "drawn up in writing."

It need scarcely be added that in using such language, our English Reforming Divines are not to be understood as meaning that sacraments *contain grace*, or *confer* or *give* grace "by the work wrought,* as they say, or by any power that remaineth in the outward signs." (On this subject see especially Becon, Catechism, pp. 218—220, and Prayers, etc., pp. 466—469) Hooker says, "for the use we have His express commandment, for the *effect* His conditional promise. . . . . We are not to doubt but that they *really give* what they promise, and *are* what they signify." (Edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 258.) But again he says, "As for the sacraments, they *really exhibit*, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they *are not really* nor *do really contain* in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow." (Pages 352, 353.)

Fulke says—"Our wrangler in this place after a flat lie solemnly avouched against us, of that we say, the sacraments give no grace *ex opere operato*, 'of the work wrought,' he frameth a spider's web, first, 'that we deprive them of all grace, virtue, and *efficacy*;' because we do not *include* grace, virtue, and *efficacy*, *within the external elements*, or the *ministry of man* about them, but ascribe the same to

* The expression "ex opere operato" is of frequent occurrence in the writings of our Reformers and their successors. It is always used by them to express a view of sacramental efficacy which they rejected. And this use serves to mark their clear sense of the difference between their teaching and the teaching of the Church of Rome on this point. It does not imply any ignorance of the Romish distinction between the effect "ex opere operato" and that "ex opere operantis." (See e.g. Jewel, "Harding, Thess. etc.," pp. 750, 754, 755, 756.)

That the difference between Romish and Reformed doctrine as indicated by this expression is real (though it may sometimes have been exaggerated,—see Pusey "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 242—246; and Forbes—"Questiones Modestæ," tom. ii., p. 611. Edit. A. C. L.) can hardly admit of question. (See Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, pp. 221, 222, 223, 232, 246, 247. Bishop Harold Browne on Articles, pp. 593, 600—602. Edit. 1868. Rogers on Articles, pp. 247, 248. P. S. Edit. Chamier, Panstrat., Cathol., vol. iv., pp. 25—28, especially p. 26 a, 1627; and Willet's Synopsis Papismi, vol. v., p. 36.)

the mighty work of God's Spirit in His chosen children, which worketh all His gifts in all men according to the good pleasure of His own will." (Defence of Translations, p. 450.)

Hooper says "that the sacraments are not of any force by virtue or strength of any outward work of the same (which of superstition is called *opus operatum*), but only by the virtue and means of the Holy Ghost working in the hearts of the doers and receivers by faith." (Later Writings, p. 125. See especially Rogers on Articles, pp. 247—250, 268.)

Ridley says—"True it is, every sacrament hath grace annexed unto it instrumentally. But there is divers understanding of this word 'habet,' 'hath:' for the sacrament hath not grace *included* in it." And again, in reply to Watson's "Every sacrament of the New Testament *giveth* grace," Ridley replies—"This sacrament hath a *promise of grace*, made to those that receive it worthily, because grace is given *by it*, as by an *instrument;* not that Christ hath transfused grace into the bread and wine." (Works, p. 240, 241. See Jewell—"Harding, Thess.," etc., p. 781; and Bullinger, Decad. v., vol. iv., p. 305, sqq.)

The following is from a divine whom Archdeacon Hardwick regards as "a zealous fellow-worker" with Parker. (See Hardwick's Reformation, p. 247.) He "took an active part in the Synod of 1563."

"Some will demand whether the grace of God be contained and shut up in the sacraments, and so derived into them which receive them? *Responsio.*—The school divines, monks, friars, and other of that sort, do judge the very virtue of God, yea, and God Himself, to be contained in the sacraments. Whereupon riseth this frivolous and vain question, that is, What the mouse doth eat, when she doth gnaw the sacrament. . . . . The Holy Scriptures do teach in every place, that the mind of man and no element is the house of God's grace. Solomon doth say . . . . If the heaven of heavens do not containe thee, how much less this house!" (Bishop Alley's Πτωχο-μουσεῖον, Poor Man's Library, tom. i., p. 177 *a*; Edit. Day, 1565.)

The following is from the learned Dr. Andrew Willet:—"*The Papists.* The sacraments give grace 'ex opere operato,' by the work wrought; that is, by force and efficacy of the work and word done and said in the sacrament. . . . . *The Protestants.* The sacraments have no power to give or confer grace to the receiver: . . . . *of themselves*

they have *no operation*, but as the SPIRIT of God *worketh by them*. Neither do we say, that the sacraments are bare and naked signs of spiritual graces: but they do verily exhibit and represent Christ to as many as by faith are able and meet to apprehend Him. . . . . *Faith is not as the dryness of the wood to the sacraments as the fire*, but rather *as the kindling of the fire* which inflameth the wood: so *faith* giveth *life* to the sacraments, whereby itself is inflamed and more increased." (Synopsis Papismi, Edit. 1852, vol. v., pp. 36. 38.)

Bishop Lake says—"Though sacraments be ceremonies, yet are they ceremonies of *efficacy*. Were they only of *significancy*, the Church might have some power to ordain them; but being of efficacy, their ordination belongeth onely to God: because the efficacy floweth from his Spirit, and of his Spirit none can dispose but himself." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, "De Tempore," p. 163; Edit. 1629.)

Ambrose Fisher says—"Though sacraments do not actively, physically, and by infusion *confer grace*, yet none but public enemies to all sacraments will deny that they *bring grace passively*, and by the assistance of the concurrent Spirit of God." (Defence of the Liturgy, p. 115; London, 1630.)

Let it be noted, that Melancthon expressed himself as to the *efficacy* of the sacraments thus.—"Ut in *ipsa actione* Spiritus Sanctus adest *baptismo* et est *efficax* in *baptisato;* sic *cum sumitur* cœna, adest Christus ut sit *efficax*. Nec adest propter panem, sed propter *sumentem*." (Quoted in Hardwick's Reformation, pp. 63, 64, note; Edit. second.)

Let it be noted also, that that Luther himself at one * time taught that "sacramenta novæ legis sunt EFFICACIA *signa* gratiæ, *si credas*, ET NON AMPLIUS;" and that these words are quoted with approval in the "Consensus Orthodoxus" of Gualter (p. 124, Edit. 1605), which adds—"Recte his et aliis locis Lutherus sacramenta definit esse visibilia signa, seu pignora promissæ in verbo gratiæ, quibus in fide his utentibus CONFERTUR *et obsignatur*. Qua Lutheri definitione CORPORALIS PRÆSENTIA† *non magis contineri*, et vel ad signum novi

* Bucer says—"Jam et Lutherus primus omnium, hoc quidem seculo, impugnavit sententiam illam scholæ; sacramenta ex se conferre gratiam, sine bono motu cordis, absque fide. Itaque et in hac quæstione oppugnavit Zuinglius quod Lutherus non affirmavit." (*Retractatio* in *Scripta Anglicana*, Basil, 1577, p. 644.)

† Compare the following from Melancthon:—"Adest filius Dei in ministerio Evangelii, et ibi certo est efficax in credentibus. Ac adest non propter panem, sed propter

testamenti, quod credentibus gratiam promittit, vel ad ipsam promissam gratiam referri potest, quam in Augustini definitione possit." The "Consensus Orthodoxus" approves also of the teaching "Sacramenta esse talia signa, a Deo instituta, ut iis legitimè utenti detur et CONFERATUR gratia, quasi ex pactione divina, qua se ad gratiæ collationem hac sacramentorum institutione adstrinxit." * (Ibid, p. 125.)

Moreover Œcolampadius expressly calls the Eucharistic elements a "*signum efficax*." He says, "Non dicimus panem hunc nudum quidem signum in cœna, sed *efficax* quodammodo, operante Spiritu sancto."

And these words of Œcolampadius are quoted with high approval (1) by Bullinger, in his Commentary, (p. 209, Zurich, 1539) on 1 Cor. xi. (2) by R. Gualter, in the "Consensus Orthodoxus." (Præf. Apol. under "Non sumus Sacramentarii.")

It may be added, that Beza speaks not seldom of the "efficacia sacramentorum," or uses equivalent language. See *e. g.*, his Tractat.

hominem. . . . . Sed hanc veram et simplicem doctrinam de fructu, nominant quidam cothurnos: et postulant dici, an sit corpus in pane, aut speciebus panis. Quasi vero Sacramentum propter panem, et illam Papisticam adorationem institutum sit. Postea fingunt, quomodo includant pani: alii conversionem, alii transubstantionem, alii Ubiquitatem excogitarunt. Hæc portentosa omnia ignota sunt eruditæ velustati." (Melancthon's "Judicium de Controversia Cœnæ Domini," 1559, in Works of Ursinus, vol. ii., p. 1429; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

* Compare the following from the Confession of Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1631. "Credimus Evangelica Sacramenta . . . . esse duo constare verbo et elemento, esseque signacula promissionum Dei, et *conferre gratiam* non dubitamus: ut autem sacramentum sit integrum, opus esse ut concurrat res terrena, et actio externa, cum usu rei terrenæ a Christo Domino instituto, atque cum vera fide conjuncto, quia *fidei defectus præjudicat integritati Sacramenti*." (In Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum, Part ii., p. 59; Edit. Geneva, 1654.)

[NOTE.—This is from the Confession of Cyril Lucar, whose history is probably well known to many of my readers. His Confession has since been rejected and condemned by the Greek Church, and a very different doctrine concerning the Sacraments in general, and the Eucharist in particular, distinctly enunciated. See Kimmel's "Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiæ Orientalis," Jena, 1850, pp. 457—463, 451, also 126; and Prolegomena, p. xxi. sqq. See also Koecher, Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ et Catecheticæ, etc., pp. 58—60, 1751. Some account of Cyril's history, and of the repudiation of his doctrine will be found in "The Christian Observer," April, 1870. See also Horneck, "The Crucified Jesus," pp. 145, 146; London, 1727.

In 1721 the Patriarchs of the Greek Church, reasserting Transubstantiation, pronounced the Eucharistic doctrine of the non-jurors to be *blasphemous*. See Lathbury's History of the Non-Jurors, p. 325.]

Theol. (Geneva, 1582.) Vol. i., p. 24, under xxxi., "*Definitio Sacramenti*," and the words quoted with approval from St. Augustin under xxxii. ("*majoris efficacia*," etc.); and p. 25 under xxxiii.; and p. 30 under l.; also p. 207, under 2, "*Unde efficacia illa Sacramentorum?*" and p. 216, "*Symbola vera et efficaciæ plena.*"

Rodolph Gualter will be found in his Commentary also attributing to the Sacraments "*efficaciæ illa propter Christi institutionem.*" (In Acta Apost. Homil., Zurich, 1577, vol. i., p. 8.)

Nay, Peter Martyr himself earnestly maintains the "*efficacia sacramenti*," contending that the consecrated elements in the Eucharist are made to be "*signa efficacia*," as will be seen by the following extracts from his "Tractatio de Sacramento Eucharistiæ, habita Oxonii." Speaking of the Zuinglians, he says, "Deinde non adjecerunt semper ei *efficaciam* quæ illi debetur. *Non* enim efficiuntur ista vulgaria *signa*, sed quæ potenter atque *efficaciter* animum permoveant." And the margin here has "De efficaciâ sacramenti." (Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1627. Basle, 1580.) And a little further on he says, "Non itaque auferenda est hæc mutatio a pane et vino, qua reddantur *signa* corporis et sanguinis Christi *efficacia*, id est, quibus potenter et non vulgariter Spiritus Domini in nos agat, modo fide et pietate simus præditi." (Page 1627.)

Elsewhere he speaks of "Sacramentorum effecta." (Page 1503.)

Moreover, not only does the former confession of Helvetia contain an article (No. 20,) "Of the force and *efficacy* of the sacraments," but the latter confession of Helvetia (1566) expresses distinctly its *disapproval* of those who regard the sacraments as NOT *effectual signs* ("signa efficacia,") thus, "Neque probamus eorum quoque doctrinam, qui de sacramentis perinde loquuntur, ut *signis* communibus, non sanctificatis aut *efficacibus*." (Sylloge Confessionum, p. 79. Oxford, 1827.)

Calvin's Catechism teaches "Vim *efficaciamque Sacramenti* . . . totam a Spiritu Dei manare." (In Works, vol. viii., p. 25, Amsterdam, 1667). And in his "Expositio" of the Consensus Tigurinus, Calvin says "Quæritur, quænam Sacramentorum *efficacia* sit." (Ibid, p. 654.) And in his "Secunda Defensio" against Westphal, he says, "De legitimo Sacramentorum usa, dignitate et *efficacia* reverenter me scripsisse, ne ipse quidem negat." (Ibid, p. 659.)

Calvin also in his work, "De verâ participatione, etc.," 1561,

declares, "Ea parte ipsius Dei *non* proponi *vacua signa*, sed veritatem et *efficaciam* simul conjunctam esse." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 477.)

Again, Calvin denies that unbelievers, "dum respuunt quod datur" do "quicquam ex Sacramenti efficacia detrahere." (Page 479.)

Moreover, even Œcolampadius declared, "Aversamur tanquam sanctæ Ecclesiæ Christi, hostes . . . . qui . . . . aut nudum absque *efficacibus* promissionibus *symbolum* ac ludum arbitrantur." (See his letter to Bucer in Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, 1530, in Works, vol. iv., p. 187. Geneva, 1581.)

Hospinian says, speaking of the reformed, "ut vera et *efficacia* Sacramenta in Cœna ex Domini instituto considerant." (Concordia Discors. In Works, vol. v., p. 49*a*.)

Chamier says, "Diximus utrinque concedi Sacramenta in signis, non illis vulgaribus. . . . . Sed efficacibus. Et efficaciam hanc in eo esse, ut gratia spiritualis, quam significari nemo negat, etiam reapse exhibeatur. . . . . Sed hoc cujusmodi sit efficaciæ genus, longa contentio est." (Panstratiæ Catholicæ tom. iv., p. 25*a*, 1627. See also p. 28.)

Rogers says (On Articles, p. 247, P.S. Edit.), "Infinitely doth God declare His unspeakable and incomprehensible good will to manward, yet in these days by none outward things more notably and *effectually* than by the sacraments. . . . This truth do the *purer churches of these days everywhere acknowledge*."

It may be worth while, perhaps, to notice that while the sentence in our Article is evidently framed from the Augustan Confession, Article xiii., the word "*efficacia*" does *not* occur in the corresponding sentence of the Lutheran formulary, which reads thus:—"Sacramenta instituta esse, non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, set multo magis, ut sint *signa et testimonia* voluntatis Dei erga nos." (See Sylloge Confessionum, pp. 127 and 173.)

The word "efficacia," as applied to the sacraments, does, however, occur in Article viii., an article which was thoroughly approved, (as was the other teaching concerning the sacraments in general,) by the Reformed. (See Hospinian as quoted in Goode on Eucharist, vol. ii., pp. 984, 985. The different wording of the German and Latin of this article may be seen side by side in Pusey's "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 39, 40.)

It is also found in the ninth of the xiii. Articles, which appear to have been agreed upon between the Lutheran and English divines in 1538. (See Hardwick, on Articles, pp. 61 and 268.)

This Article condemns the teaching that sacraments confer grace. "Ex opere operato." And, as regard adults, may be said to expand the early *dictum* of Luther, that sacraments are "efficacia signa,"—"si Credas, et non amplius."

Note B, p. 614.

"If it had been intended that Article XXIX. should merely express the truth that wicked men do not in the Sacrament partake of Christ to the benefit of their souls, the framers of that Article would surely have simply inserted the actual words of St. Augustine, which run thus (the words between brackets are supposed by the Benedictine editors to have been interpolated):—'By this, he who abides not in Christ, nor Christ in him, without doubt eats not [spiritually] His Flesh nor drinks His Blood [though he carnally and visibly press with his teeth the Sacrament of His Body and Blood], but rather, he eats and drinks to his condemnation, the Sacrament of so great a thing.' The framers of the Article, it will be observed, left out this word 'spiritually' in the title, and in the Article itself added the words 'in nowise are they partakers of Christ,' and explained the word 'sacrament,' in the last clause, to mean simply 'sign,' as though to avoid the possibility of misconception. See Harold Browne on the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 727." (Principles at Stake, p. 145.)

Mr. Grueber takes notice of this, saying, "It will be seen that it might have been cited either as saying of the wicked 'nec manducant Carnem ejus,' or according to the Benedictine edition, 'nec *spiritaliter* manducant Carnem ejus.' Now the expression 'nec manducant,' without qualification, or reference to other Formularies, might have been construed as denying that the wicked do eat the 'Thing signified' in the Sacrament is plain, though indeed it would not have denied that they 'receive' it; but it is equally plain that the expression 'nec manducant *spiritaliter*' neither did nor could deny it, but rather, on the contrary, is affirmative of it. Indeed it is remarkable

that the entire passage of St. Augustine cited with 'spiritaliter' appears in the Roman Office, 'In Festo Corporis Christi.'" (Reply to Dr. Heurtley, pp. 39, 40.) The argument which Mr. Grueber would build on this rests on the assumption that the words "in nowise are partakers of Christ" [*nullo tamen modo Christi participes efficiuntur*] expresses much less than "nec manducant." Indeed, it would appear, I think that in Mr. Grueber's opinion, if the Article had said that "the wicked do not receive Christ's body," the Real Objective Presence would have been *excluded;* but that the declarations that they "do not EAT Christ's body," and "are in NOWISE PARTAKERS of Christ," are intended not to *exclude* it, but to *make room* for it. CAN ANYTHING, I would ask, BE FOUND IN THE WRITINGS OF THE TIME, AND IN THE WRITINGS OF OUR REFORMERS, TO WARRANT SUCH A DISTINCTION?

I am aware indeed, that it may be pleaded that Herbert Thorndike has spoken of "the *dead* faith of them that receive *it* to their condemnation in the Sacrament, and therefore cannot be said to *eat* the body and blood of Christ (which is only the act of *living* faith)." (See Thorndike's Works, Anglo Cath. Library, vol. iv., part i., p. 38.)

But, in answer, I observe,

I. That, though Thorndike's views are confessedly very peculiar and exceptional (see Abp. Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x. pp. 74, 75), yet I am fully persuaded that his views (truly understood) are very far indeed from lending any support to the "Real Objective Presence," and in particular, that when he speaks of "*dead faith receiving it*," he does not mean receiving the REAL BODY of Christ, but that *sacramental body*, which he *calls* Christ's body, because of an objective presence (independent of faith) *not* of the *body*, but of the *Spirit* of Christ, *tendering* Christ's body to the receiver. That this is his true sense is evident not only (1) from his own explanations, but (2) from his clear teaching concerning the real body of Christ, which (with our Reformers) he held (*a*) to be circumscribed by the limits of a true body, and (*b*) to be therefore restrained from any such real presence as was required by the Romish Transubstantiation or the Lutheran Consubstantiation. The reader who may desire evidence on this point, will be fully satisfied (I believe) by what Dean Goode has adduced on this point. (On Eucharist, vol. ii., pp. 904—908.)

But,

II. I must observe also, that the date of Thorndike's writings is far beyond the limits specified. We are dealing here with the theological language of our articles, and the theological language of the Reformation. And it is of the Reformation period, that I ask the question:—CAN ANYTHING BE FOUND IN THE WRITINGS OF THE TIME, AND IN THE WRITINGS OF OUR ENGLISH REFORMERS, TO WARRANT SUCH A DISTINCTION BETWEEN EATING AND RECEIVING?

And further, this question is asked concerning the language of *English* Theology, and the writings of *English* Reforming divines. It is quite true that such a distinction comes into the subtilties with which Bucer found himself constrained to defend the language which he had used and maintained in his earnest desire to effect a concord between the Lutherans and the Reformed. (See below, p. 713, sqq.) His words are "Qui credunt, nec tamen recte dejudicant hunc cibum (ut Corinthii quidam ab Apostolo culpantur) ut hos non possim negare, Christum fide, quam habent, in Cœna *percipere:* Ita non dixerim eos Christum *manducare*, postquam fidem non ritè hic exercent suam, religiosa tantorum mysteriorum dijudicatione, quæ est spiritualis cibi hujus manducatio." (See "Consensus Orthodoxus," p. 321; Zurich, 1605.) It is to be well observed, however, that in using such language Bucer carefully distinguishes the *indigni* from the *impii*, and that what is said here is said of the *indigni* in Bucer's classification, not of the *impii* of our article. "Ne tamen," he says, "aliquid concederemus, unde occasionem quispiam posset arripere statuendi vel dicendi, corpus Domini cum pane ita uniri, ut quisquis panem manducet, idem etiam corpus domini *manducet, sive credat, sive non credat*, sive etiam Turca sit vel Ethnicus, aut alius hujus actionis perversor, et Domini irrisor: Ideo non permisimus in articulo poni *incredulos*, vel *impios*, sed *indignos*, eosque tales, de quibus Apostolus Paulus scribit, quod in Ecclesia adhuc tolerari debeant." (Ibid, p. 385.)

I do not say that Bucer's distinctions may not have found some place in Geste's mind, for he appears to me (see below, Note E) to give some indications of having been brought under the influence of his teaching. Yet I do not think that I have seen any evidence of any such distinction finding a place in the writings of our English Reformers. Nor do I think that the circumstances of the case will

afford any support to the hypothesis of any such distinction finding a place in our Article.

In Bradford's case we see the synonymous use of "to eat" and "to receive." (See his Works, Sermons, etc., P.S. Edit.; pp. 91, 456, 489, 490, 511, 542, 585.) And compare Philpot's Examinations, where (p. 133) the Romanist Chedsey says, "I will prove that the evil and wicked men EAT the body of Christ," in support of his assertion that "evil men RECEIVE Christ." See also Cranmer "On Lord's Supper, where (pp. 201, 214, 217, 219, 222, 225) Gardiner speaks of "receiving" and "eating" without any distinction.

Cranmer knows no distinction between "eating" and "receiving." (See *e.g.* "On Lord's Supper," pp. 203, 204, 207, and especially 218.) Neither does Latimer (see Sermons, pp. 458, 459); nor Ridley (see Works, pp. 248, 199, 12); nor Hutchinson (Works, pp. 262, 263); nor Redmayne (see above, pp. 627, 628); nor Rogers (see above, pp. 623, 624.)

It will be seen also that in the conference with Campion the Jesuit (1581), Falke proves "He is not *received* of the wicked" from Augustine's words—"Nec dicendi sunt *manducare corpus*," of which words Campion says, "His meaning is, They *receive not* the grace of Christ effectually to salvation"; and Fulke answers, "His words are, They *receive not* the body, etc." Again, after Fulke had said, "He saith expressly they *eat* not the body, etc.," Campion declares "They *receive* Christ, but not worthily." Again, a little further on, Campion says, "They *eat* Christ sacramentally." Fulke answers, "Yea, but not in deed, as St. Augustine saith." Then Campion replies, "They *receive* the same Christ, but not the same comfort." Which again is expressed, almost immediately afterwards, thus, "The wicked *eat* the same body, but not to the same effect." (See "True Report of the Disputation, etc," Third day's Conference; Argument 9; London, 1583.)

It is true indeed, that Geste speaks of the title of the Article he deprecates, as containing the words, "do not *receive*."* But there seems to be no room for the supposition that a change from "*receive*" to "*eat*" was made by the Convocation, as if *declining* to say "the wicked do *not* RECEIVE," but *desiring* to say "they do *not* EAT" in the

* It may be observed that another of Geste's quotations is not *verbally* accurate. Geste writes—"It is further saied after a spirituall and heavenly maner onely." The words of the Article in the English version of 1563 were (as indeed Geste had previously cited them) "after an heavenly and spirituall maner onely."

sense of "FRUITFULLY RECEIVE," (see Perry, on "Declaration concerning Kneeling," p. 207), for Geste professes to be citing (as I understand him) from the draft of the Articles as signed by the Bishops in 1562.

Let Geste's words be well marked. He speaks of "the first copy of the Book of Articles." It is a copy which *had been subscribed* by "the most part of the bishops." It it a copy which has an article which "is not in the printed books, either in Latin or English." Is there any reasonable room for question that Geste is referring to the Articles of 1562, which after being signed by most of the bishops, (though not, as would appear, by Geste and Cheney), had this article struck out before being printed? [In the copy of Articles in the Record Office, State Papers, Elizabeth, Domestic vol. xxvii. 40, there is a note written in the margin of the Article. "This is *the original*, but *not printed*."] This article *then* (1562) had *not* been authorized by the queen. Geste is alarmed now at Parker's purpose to present to the queen "the *first* copy" *with* this article. In his alarm he writes to Cecil, lest now it should, through Parker's "purpose," be "confirmed and authorized by the queen's grace."

It may be observed also that when the articles were published in 1571 (with the 29th article) they were published (as they have been since) not as "Articles agreed upon in 1571," but as "Articles whereupon it was agreed . . . in the Convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord God 1562." Now, if this was the design (simply to enforce the articles of 1562 in their *entirety*, as they had come from the Convocation), how very unlikely it is that Parker should have been framing for insertion anything like a new article, instead of the one already standing in the "first copy," to which "the most part of the bishops" had already subscribed! Besides which, would not Mr. Grueber's theory require him to suppose that Parker (who in *his* view was *very favourable* to the Lutherans) prepared for the Convocation a draft of the articles, in which the 29th was, not only so worded as purposely to exclude Lutheran views, but *altered for that very purpose* from the article already signed in 1562; and then, in Convocation was compelled to alter it, so as to admit Lutheran views, and that by those, the majority of whom will, I suppose, be admitted to have been decidedly Anti-Lutheran?

When, therefore, Geste says, "And *there* in this article," I submit that he can hardly be understood as referring to anything but "the first copy" of 1562.

Now I have examined the MS. copy of the 39 Articles of the Convocation of 1562 [among the State papers, Elizabeth; Domestic, vol. xxvii. 40. Original draft (probably) and 41 Fair Copy], and THERE is indeed the 29th Article, but the title is nearly the same as we have it now—"The wicked do not eate the Bodie of Christe in the use of the Lorde's Supper." It has the word "eat," not the word "receive." (See Swainson's Essay on Art. 29, p. 32.)

So also the title of the MS. copy of the Latin Articles of 1562 (containing Archbishop Parker's markings, and the autograph signatures of the archbishops and bishops, and preserved in Corpus Christi Coll., Cambridge) is this:—"Impii non manducant Corpus Christi in usu cœnæ." (See Lamb's "Historical account of the Thirty-nine Articles," copy No. ii., p. 13, and Preface, p. iii. Also Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., pp. 35—39, note.) Therefore Geste's citing the title as saying, "*do not receive*," can only, I think, be taken as additional evidence of the indiscriminate use of the two expressions, ("to eat," and "to receive,") as applied to this subject.

To this it is to be added, that the preceding Article asserts that FAITH is "the mean whereby the body and blood of Christ are" not only *eaten*, but "RECEIVED AND eaten;" whence the natural inference would be, that as without THE MEAN there could be NO EATING, so without THE MEAN there could be NO RECEIVING for the faithless. And indeed, it may be noted, that in this same letter Geste aims at establishing his assertion concerning "*receiving*" by what St. Paul says concerning "*eating*," and by the words of our Lord, "Take, eat."

Note C, p. 614.

Any one really desirous of knowing whether the new interpretation will stand, must feel the importance of the enquiry whether the *eating and drinking* of the "res sacramenti" by the unfaithful was or was not a *moot question* at that date. If it *was*, then there can be

no doubt whatever, from the title of the Article, that the Article itself was intended to speak, and does speak to *that* question.

That it was a moot question the extracts from our Reformers' writings can leave no doubt whatever.

That it was felt in the Eucharistic Controversy to be a *most important* question, and was sometimes applied as *the testing* question on the subject of the Presence (both at home and abroad) the following quotations may be taken in evidence—

I. The first is from Cranmer's Book on the Lord's Supper, and is adduced to shew how important a place this question occupies in the matters which Cranmer sets before him to treat of in his great work.

"This therefore shall be mine issue: that as no scripture, so no ancient author known and approved, hath in plain terms your transubstantiation: nor that the body and blood of Christ be really, corporally, naturally, and carnally under the forms of bread and wine: nor that evil men do eat the very body and drink the very blood of Christ: nor that Christ is offered every day by the priest a sacrifice propitiatory for sins." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 13.)

In the section indeed "of the eating and drinking" which forms a considerable part of his book, Cranmer teaches that "though Christ were corporally in the Sacrament," "He cannot be corporally eaten," (p. 203) but this does not take away from the truth of the really testing character of this question, as a matter of fact, in its application to the controversies of the day. Those who held the Corporal Presence, did hold also that the *res sacramenti* was (in some sense) corporally eaten.

II. The second is from Bradford's last examination. It is alleged to show how this question was applied as a test to one who when asked "Dids't thou not deny Christ's presence in the Sacrament?" had truly answered "No," though he denied the inclusion of Christ in the bread.

"If He be not included," quoth the bishop of Worcester, "how is He then present?" "Forsooth, quoth Bradford, my faith knoweth how, though my tongue cannot express it, nor you otherwise than by faith hear it, or understand it." "Here was much ado now, one doctor starting up and speaking this, another that, and the lord chancellor

talking much of Luther, Zuinglius, and Œcolampadius: but still Bradford kept them at this point that Christ is present to faith, and that there is no transubstantiation nor including of Christ in the bread: but all this would not serve them. Therefore another bishop asked THIS question, *whether the wicked man received Christ's very body or no?* And Bradford *answered plainly*, 'No.' Whereat the lord chancellor made a long oration how that it *could not be* that Christ was *present*, except that the *evil man* receive Him." (Bradford's Works, i., pp. 488-9. See also pp. 511 and 531.)

III. The third is from Philpot's examinations, and shows how the same question was applied as a test in his case also by one who said "These say you do confess a real presence; but I will be hanged if you will abide by it: you will deny it by and by."

Chedsey:—"If there be a *real presence* in the sacrament, then *evil men receive Christ:* which thing you *will not grant* I am sure."

Philpot:—"I deny the argument; for I do not grant in the sacrament by transubstantiation any real presence, as you falsely imagine, but in the due administration to the worthy receivers."

Chedsey:—"I will prove that the evil and wicked men eat of the body of Christ, as well as the good men, by St. Austin here." (Philpot's Examinations, p. 133.)

IV. The fourth is from the letter of Hierome Zanchius to Bishop Grindal, dated at Strasburgh, before Aug. 23, 1563 (given in Zurich Letters, P. S. Edit., ii., p. 98, sqq.) The occasion is thus stated by Strype (Grindal, p. 75):

"Hierom Zanchy, an Italian by birth, was now public reader of divinity at Strasburgh: with him Grindal was acquainted ever since himself lived there, and since his departure kept a correspondence with him. This year letters happened between them upon this occasion. The Augustan Confession about this time began to be pressed vigorously, and particularly in the said town of Strasburgh, upon all the reformed there, or no abiding for them. This was the cause of great contests and debates between the learned Lutherans in the school there, and Zanchy, who in the matter of the sacrament, and predestination, and some other things, could not accord with their Confession. But at last for peace sake, this year, the

difference was composed, and he did subscribe (yet with some exceptions and conditions) in these words, Hanc doctrinæ formulam ut piam agnosco: ita etiam recipio ego Hieronymus Zanchius. This being so large a concession to the Lutheran doctrine, he saw, might justly make the reformed in other parts to wonder at his subscription." (See Grindal's Remains, p. 277.)

The letter shews how Zanchius and the Lutherans could come to a verbal agreement, Zanchius allowing in some sense all the doctrinal statements submitted to him, until the question of the reception by the unworthy is found to be the application of a test, which brings out the real disagreement.

The following is the conclusion of that part of the letter which relates the conference on this subject:

"Here James Andreas exclaims with astonishment, 'Truly then you hold the same opinion as we do'.... 'If it is also yours, I rejoice for myself, and congratulate you and the Church.' 'Now,' says he, 'I see why you have brought so many arguments (namely in my confession) against our statement that the body of Christ is also eaten with the bodily mouth, because you suppose that we hold the body of Christ to be eaten with the mouth of our body, as if the body of Christ were in contact with our mouth and body.' 'Just so,' I replied, 'I supposed from your writings that such was your opinion.' 'By no means,' said he,' by no means do we entertain this view, but only express ourselves in this way by reason of the sacramental union.' I then said, 'If these are your sentiments, I do not find fault with that expression, for I also admit, that on account of the sacramental union there is attributed to the body of Christ what is the property of bread, and on the other hand, to bread, what belongs to the body of Christ.' '*But what,*' says he, '*do you think of the* EATING OF THE UNWORTHY?' 'If by this term,' I answered, 'you mean men who are clearly ungodly and destitute of true faith, I cannot admit that the body of Christ is eaten by such persons. But if you mean such persons as are endued with faith, albeit a weak one, and of a more relaxed life than is becoming to a Christian, I do not deny it; for such were those Corinthians who, because they had eaten the body of the Lord unworthily, St. Paul says, were judged, that is, were chastened of the Lord, that they should not be condemned with the world.' We could not therefore agree about this article. 'But I have no doubt,' he said, 'that if

you will more diligently examine this article, you will come over to our sentiments.' 'I have already,' I replied, 'examined it with sufficient attention, and am unable to think otherwise than as I do.' 'Well,' says he, 'we have said enough upon the supper.'" (Letter of Hierome Zanchius to Grindal, Aug. 23, 1563, in Zurich Letters, ii., p. 101.)

V. Hence we find the early endeavours for reconciliation obliged to aim at leaving this one question untouched.

"A. 1531. In controversia . . . de cœna Domini id potissimum a Bucero, qui conciliatoris partes sumserat, postulabat, ut præsentia Christi in signis corporalibus agnosceretur; volebat interim tunc quæstionem, *an impii etiam corpus Domini sumerent, suspendi.*" (Seckendorf, Historia Lutheranismi. Lib. iii., sect. iii., §. 7.)

VI. Hence also we find Luther, when, after writing against the Mass, he had been supposed to have changed his view of the Real Presence, publishing a letter on the subject (1534), in which, after declaring that the body of Christ is received "a communicantibus sub panis elemento;" he says "Accipitur autem hoc corpus et hic sanguis *non solum a sanctis et dignis, sed a peccatoribus et indignis,* vere et corporaliter, licit invisibiliter, manu, ore, etc." (See Seckendorf, Historia Lutheranismi. Lib. iii., sect. 8, §. xxvii.)

VII. Hence also, in 1536, when Bucer came to negotiate with Luther for a reconciliation with the Reformed, Luther, we are told, "ex ardore suo nihil remittens, postulabat revocationem eorum, quæ de figurato verborum Christi in cœnæ institutione intellectu docuissent, et ut eadem, quæ ipse, profiterentur"—and demanded "ut cogitarent, et sequenti die renunciarent, quid sentirent;"—we are told "Die itaque 24 Maii. . . . Bucerus confessus est, se aliter quædam intellexisse, neque satis probata docuisse, revocaturum se illa ore et scripto, quovis mode. Dein . . . profitebatur panem verum esse corpus Christi . . . vere etiam sumi corpus Christi . . . non tantum corde, sed etiam ore sumentium, a *dignis ad salutem, ab indignis ad judicium.*"

After this, we are told Luther was satisfied, and a reconciliation effected. But then "Jussi sunt sententiam priorem aliorum cordibus

eximere, et hanc, quam professi nunc essent, docere, aut si rudi populo durum videretur, si diceretur, *impios corpus Domini sumere*, verbis Pauli uti, qui *indignos* nominat." (See Seckendorf, Historia Lutheranismi. Lib. iii., sect. 15, §. xlvii.)

VIII. Further important evidence to the same effect will be found in the following extract from Seckendorf. 1539, "Recruduerat inter iilum [*Johannem Forsterum*] et *Michaelem Cellarium* rixa de quæstione Sacramentaria, quæ concordia Wittembergensi anno 1536, et speciatim Augustæ penitus sopita videbatur: Forsterus nihilominus Cellarium Zuinglianismi suspectum habebat, ejusque mentem propositis quæstionibus penetrare tentaverat, inter quas erat, *an indigni vere et substantialiter sumant corpus et sanguinem Domini?* quam omnes, qui præsentiam non nisi fide assequandam statuunt, negare compelluntur. Cellarius non solum silentio eum evitaverat, sed et Fosterum apud Magistratum detulerat." (Seckendorf, Historia Lutheranismi. Lib. iii., sect. 18, §. lxviii., 35.)

IX. Hence we find this question being dealt with in Reformed Confessions of faith. It was not the Church of England alone which desired, by speaking to this testing question, to give distinctness to the statements on Eucharistic doctrine.

(1) Thus speaks (1566) the latter Confession of Helvetia (with which Grindal declared to Bullinger our entire agreement), "As for him that without faith cometh to this holy Table of the Lord he is made partaker of the Sacrament only; but the matter of the Sacrament, from whence cometh life and salvation, he receiveth not at all. (Hall's Harmony, p. 319.)

(2) And so the Confession of Belgia (1566), agreed to by the English delegates at Dort, declares, "An evil man verily receiveth the Sacrament to his own condemnation; but the thing or truth of the Sacrament he receiveth not. As, for example, Judas, and Simon Magnus, did both of them receive the Sacrament sign; but as for Christ himself, signified thereby, they received Him not. For Christ is communicated to the faithful only." (Hall's Harmony, p. 337.)

(3) So the Westminster Confession, "Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward Elements in this Sacrament; yet they receive not the thing signified thereby: but by their unworthy

coming thereunto are guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord to their own damnation." (Edit. 1658. p. 100.)

X. On the other hand, before our Church rejected the Corporal Presence the same testing question was dealt with, and had given to it an opposite answer.

(1) Thus the Ten Articles of 1536 declare "that. under the same form and figure of bread and wine, the very self-same body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, and in very substance, *exhibited, distributed, and received unto and of* ALL THEM *which receive the said Sacrament.*"

(2) And the Articles of 1538 teach "quod sub eisdem speciebus vere et realiter exhibentur et distribuuntur illis qui Sacramentum accipiunt, *sive bonis, sive malis.*" * (See Dr. Heurtley's "Remarks on Declaration," pp. 7, 8; and Hardwick on Articles, p. 265.)

XI. Hence we find Bellarmine saying of the Reformed "Ex hoc sequitur Sextum eorum pronunciatum, quo asserunt homines improbos non percipere Corpus Christi, licet symbola percipiant." (De Eucharistiâ, lib. i., cap. 1.)

XII. If further evidence yet be desired of the testing character of this question, as felt and understood at the time of the Reformation, the reader may be referred to Beza's Tractationes Theol., especially the following pages, with their contexts:—Vol. i., pp. 228, 248, 287, 573, 621; vol. ii.. pp. 131, 143, 173. Edit. 1582.

One quotation only is here given—"HESHUSIUS [Lutheran] Ipsi etiam *increduli, impii, et damnati*, vescuntur carne Christi: ergo necesse est aliquem esse carnis esum corporalem tam piis quam impiis communem, qui distinguitur a spirituali, in quo videlicet percipiatur ipsa vita. THEOPHILUS. Quid si tibi hoc concedam? HES. Nempe *noster eris.*" (Beza, Tract. Theol. Genev. 1582, vol. i., p. 287.)

* So also in the Confession of Dositheus (drawn up at the Synod of Jerusalem, 1672,) it is declared—"Ετι αὐτὸ τὸ πανακήρατον τοῦ κυρίου σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μεταδίδοσθαι καὶ εἰσδύειν εἰς τὸ στόμα καὶ στόμαχον τῶν μετεχόντων εὐσεβῶν τε καὶ ἀσεβῶν. (See Kimmel's "Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiæ Orientalis, p. 458, Jenæ, 1850.)

XIII. Further evidence arises from the Smalkaldic Articles, which constituted a stricter test of Lutheran doctrine, than the Augustan Confession supplied.

Here it is declared, "De Sacramento altaris sentimus, panem et vinum in Cœna esse verum corpus et sanguinem Christi: et scimus hæc porrigi et accipi non tantùm a bonis, verum etiam a malis Christianis." (See Hospinian, 1537, vol. iv., pp. 273, 274.)

In this connexion let the reader mark the following—"Forma Sacramenti consistit in δόσει et λήψει, quam designat Aæ Confess. distributione et perceptione corporis et sanguinis Domini, quod ita declarat Apologia, quod *corpus et sanguis Domini veré exhibeantur cum illis rebus*, quæ videntur, pane et vino, *his qui Sacramentum accipiunt;* UNDE RESULTAT id, quod disertè proponunt art. Smalcald., p. 3, art. 6. *Verum corpus et sanguinem Christi in Cœnâ non tantùm dari et sumi a piis, sed etiam ab impiis Christianis.*" (Calov. Exegema Augustanæ Confessionis. Witteberg., 1665, art. x., sect. 7.)

XIV. Peter Martyr, speaking of the Lutherans and their views, had taught at Oxford, in Edward's reign, "Alterum vero, nimirum quod etiam *impiis detur* Corpus Christi, vident *necessario consequi:* sed . . . . efficacibus rationibus probatum est, impios tantum sumere externa elementa." (Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1616. Basle, 1580.)

XV. I add in evidence, that Ursinus, in his Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, gives at the conclusion a statement of matters of agreement and disagreement in the Eucharistic controversy between "the churches which profess the Gospel." And he states the matters of dissent as *three*. The two first are (in short) these:—1. The one part will understand the words "*This is my body*" as they *sound*. 2. The one part will have the *body* to be essentially *in* or *with* the bread. The third is given thus—"3. The one part will have *all*, whosoever come to the table of the Lord's Supper, and eat and drink that bread and wine, whether they be *believers* or *unbelievers*, to *eat* and *drink*, corporally and with their bodily mouth, the flesh and blood of Christ, believers to life and salvation, unbelievers to damnation and death; the other holdeth, that unbelievers abuse indeed the outward signs, bread and wine, to their damnation, but that the *faithful*

only can *eat* and *drink*, by a true *faith*, and the fore-alleged working of the Holy Ghost, the body and blood of Christ unto eternal life." (Page 480. See quotation in Nevin's "Mystical Presence," p. 93.)

Again, in the Appendix, Ursinus gives a brief summary of objections made by "Con-substantiaries" against the "sincere doctrine of the Lord's Supper" as held by those called "Sacramentaries." From these I extract the following Objection and Answer:—

"4th Obj. The Sacramentaries affirm that the true body of Christ, which hung on the cross, and His very blood which was shed for us, is *distributed* and is *spiritually received* of those who are *worthy receivers;* as for the *unworthy*, they *receive nothing* besides the *bare signs*, to their own condemnation.

"*Ans.* All this *we grant*, as being agreeable to the Word of God, the nature of Sacraments, the analogy of faith, and the communion of the faithful." (Page 472. English Trans. See quotation in Nevin's "Mystical Presence," p. 92.)

XVI. Yet further I add, in evidence, the following extract from Bucer's Letter to Pontanus, 1530, "Pro vero affirmare non dubito, Controversiam inter Lutherum et Zuinglium et Œcolampadium, quantum ego intelligo, in tribus consistere punctis.

"*Quomodo scilicet verba illa: Hoc est corpus meum, sint intelligenda?*

"*Quomodo homines Corpus Christi comedant?*

"*Qui illud accipiant?*" (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, part ii., 1530; in Works, vol. iv., p. 178. Geneva, 1681.)

When he comes to write on the third point he commences by saying, "Tertiò, de illo etiam controvertitur, *an impii Corpus Christi percipiant?*" (Page 180.)

XVII. Again, the ministers of Augsburg, declaring their matters of dissent from Luther, say, "Item .... colligimus .... verum corpus et sanguinem Domini *neminem* accipere, *qui non* verè in Christum *credat*, ejusque membrum sit .... In hac certè actione *incredulis nihil præter Sacramenta* concedere possumus, non vero ipsam Christi Domini manducationem, ut quæ semper vitam æternam

conferat." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, part ii., 1533; in Works, vol. iv., p. 216. Geneva, 1681.)

And again, "Concedere non possumus, Christum Dominum nostrum cibum .... verè et per sese à quoquam sine fide accipi et manducari." (Ibid., p. 218.)

And again, "Cum hanc actionem ad infideles minime pertinentem, solis credentibus relinquimus: Lutherus ita interdum loquitur, ut actionem hanc etiam cum incredulis communem facere velle videatur." (Ibid., p. 239.)

XVIII. This also may be added from a letter of Luther himself: "Si Argentinenses animum obfirmârunt, ut nobiscum sentire et credere nolint, corpus et sanguinem Christi etiam externè in pane et vino adesse, et *a piis pariter ac impiis porrigi, tractari, et accipi;* maturè omni conciliationis labore et molestiâ supersedere poterant." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, Part ii., 1531, in Works, vol. iv., p. 205; Geneva, 1681.)

And this from another letter of Luther:—"Cum ipso [Bucero] (Coburgæ) agebam de illa corporali præsentia, quâ utrique, *tam infideles quàm fideles*, etiam ore verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi, sub pane et vino accipiunt." (Ibid, p. 205.)

XIX. Yet again, we are told that three questions were propounded to Peucer. 1st. Concerning the omnipotence of Christ's humanity. 2nd. Concerning the presence of Christ's body at the same time in heaven and on earth. 3rd. "*Tertia quæstio fuit:* An credat *Peucerus*, quòd Christi Corpus ore in Cœna sacra accipiatur ab *omnibus* qui accedunt, sive fidem veram habeant, sive non?" (See Hospinian, "De Origine et prog. Libri Concord.," in Works, vol. v., p. 343; Geneva, 1678.)

XX. Further evidence is furnished by the "Harmonia Confessionum," which (failing the project of one common Confession for the Reformed Churches) was drawn up, at the suggestion of the Protestants of Zurich and Geneva, under the auspices of Beza, Daneau, and Salnar; chiefly, it is said, by the hand of Salnar. (See Hall's Introduction to Harmony, pp. xi., xii.) This was first published in Latin, in 1581, at Geneva.

The Preface, dwelling on the agreement of Protestant Confessions, thus speaks of the matter of the Eucharistic controversy with the Lutherans:—"Sed hæc superest quæstio, an ut signum sic etiam res ipsa præsens corpori, an verò potius signum quidem præsens corpori, res autem præsens duntaxat menti et fidei præbeatur. Item an sicut quibusvis utrunque præbetur, sic *a quibusvis utrunque sumatur, ab aliis quidem ad vitam, ab aliis vero ad mortem.*" ("Harmonia Confessionum," Præfatio; Geneva, 1581.)

Truth, however, requires it, I think, to be frankly acknowledged, that one* remarkable case, in particular, (to which some of the above

* Another exception would have to be made in the case of the *Repetitio Anhaltina* (see Niemayer's *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 628), if it were indeed a *Reformed* Confession.

But it will be found that in the Preface is contained an unqualified profession of adherence to Luther and Lutheran doctrine (see Niemayer, p. 616; which, however, is not to be understood as an unconditional acceptance of *everything* that Luther had written—see Hospinian, Works, vol. v., pp. 139*b*, 140*a*; Geneva, 1678); and there is nothing in its declarations concerning the Eucharist at variance with this profession.

I suppose the reason of its being printed by Niemayer among the Confessions of the *Reformed*, must have been its distinct rejection of *Ubiquity*, against which its teaching is chiefly directed.

But the doctrine of Ubiquity was not persistently held or taught by Luther himself. (See Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 347, note; Edit. Soames. And Horneck's "Crucified Jesus," pp. 140, 141; London, 1727.)

Even when Ultra-Lutheranism had developed itself in the *Formula Concordiæ*, and therein had stamped upon itself (in some degree) the character of *Ubiquity*, there were still some Lutherans who stood apart. (See Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 346.)

And though the prominent upholders of the *Formula* maintained that the doctrine of *Ubiquity* was essential to the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence (see Hospinian, vol. v., pp. 225*a*, 227*a*, 228*a*), yet this *dictum* did not meet with universal acceptance among Lutherans. (See Hospinian, vol. v., p. 225*a*, etc., etc.)

Doubtless the tendency of such a falling away of the Anhalt Theologians (and of other Lutherans also) from the later definitions of Lutheran doctrine (concerning the Person of Christ), was to draw them towards the Reformed: and it was not an unnatural result, that subsequently (1595) the Lutheran worship was found in Anhalt to give place (for the most part) to the worship of the Reformed. (See Mosheim, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 385, and note 3; Edit. Soames, 1845.)

But at the date of the drawing-up of the *Repetitio* (1579—see Niemayer, 612; Hospinian, v., 264*a*) I believe it will be found that, while rejecting Ubiquity of more recent Lutheranism, the theologians of Anhalt were as yet clinging to the Consubstantiation of Luther.

Indeed, shortly before this (1578) we find the Lutheran Musculus stigmatizing them as a *new* sort of Sacramentaries, who denied *Ubiquity*, but held the doctrine of the Presence (*qui præsentiam credunt, et Ubiquitatem negant*). (See Hospinian, vol. v., p. 225*a*. See also p. 140*a*, 225*b*, 227*a*, 228*a*.)

Not only so, but we find them expressing a general concurrence with the teaching of the *Formula Concordiæ*, so far as relates to the Lord's Supper. (See Hospinian, vol. v., p. 139*b*.)

extracts have reference) may quite fairly be alleged as seeming to tell on the other side. It is the case of the *Concordia Witebergensis* (1536), in which Bucer (who had been identified with the Reformed) allowed language concerning the case of the unworthy receivers, with which Luther was brought (for concord's sake) to express himself satisfied.

But then it must be remembered—(1) that this *Concord* belongs to the *comparatively* early history of the controversy; (2) that in the first stages of this history, opinions on both sides appear to have been *taking* shape and *hardening*, rather than to have had already their sharp points fixed (witness, *e.g.*, the *Syngramma Suevicum* attacking positions, as of Œcolampadius, which the Swiss afterwards repudiated; and standing, as on Luther's side, upon ground which, in part, was found afterwards to belong to the Reformed rather than to Luther); (3) that Luther's earlier views appear to have been fluctuating, or uncertain, or inconsistent—perhaps some will think they never ceased to be self-contradictory; (4) that Bucer's intense desire (for the sake of which labour and toil and pains were to him as nothing) was to be a peacemaker between the two parties who, agreeing in the faith of the Gospel, were becoming separated (to the joy of the Papists) on the doctrine of the Eucharist (see Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., Edit. Soames, vol. iii., pp. 355, 361, 359, 117, 118, 119; Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, pp. 84, 86, 91); (5) that in this longing for peace he was brought to persuade himself, (*a*) that what sounded amiss in Luther's sayings ought fairly to be interpreted by his other sayings, and might thus be deprived of every objectionable sense (see Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," pp. 105, 106), and (*b*) that thus the separation between the parties was made and kept up by human heart-burnings and verbal disagreements, rather than any real doctrinal difference; (6) that Bucer found that all his labours for peace would prove vain, unless some concession were made as to the language of the Reformed concerning reception by the unworthy; (7) that though thus he was brought to use (and subsequently to defend) language on the subject which had a certain Lutheran sound, he used it not in the full Lutheran sense—(see Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 253*b*); (8) that notwithstanding all his explanations, the esteem in which he was so justly held could not hinder the growth of a certain suspicion and shyness (to say the least)

towards him on the part of the Reformed (see Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," pp. 57, 72, 106, 108); (9) that here in England, honoured as he was, his quasi-Lutheran language (to say the least) was felt to be indefensible, and somewhat to hamper our Reformers in their controversy with Papists (see Cranmer on Lord's Supper, pp. 19, 21, 90, 91, 126, 223, 224, 225; Jewel, Sermon and Harding, pp. 468, 469, 498, 499; Original Letters, pp. 61, 544, 675, 678, 572, 652, 666, 662, 545, 696, 697; Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. iv., p. 41; Hardwick's Reformation, p. 166 note, 220, 221, and notes); (10) that after all, the *Concordia Witebergensis* was found to be but the slender bridge of a verbal agreement thrown over a real doctrinal chasm—a bridge which may, indeed, have helped some to pass over to real Lutheran views, but one which was quite unable to unite the separated doctrines, and which very soon broke down and was swept away altogether; that therefore, giving all honour to Bucer, as a "peacemaker," we can hardly do otherwise than acknowledge that his labour for reconciliation made him somewhat blind to some of the aspects of the question; (11) that time,* as it brought out more clearly the real merits and points of the controversy, made it to be more and more apparent that a real and insuperable doctrinal difference existed, and that a crucial test of the difference was to be found in the question of the reception by such as be void of a lively faith.

* How entirely the Lutherans themselves subsequently repudiated Bucer's subtle distinctions (those on which the *Concordia Witebergensis* rested), is plain from the "Formula Concordiæ," in which it is said—"Credimus, docemus, et confitemur, unum tantum genus esse indignorum convivarum, ii sunt soli illi, qui non credunt." And again—"Credimus, docemus, et confitemur, quod nullus vere credentium, quam diu vivam fidem retinet, sacram Domini cœnam ad judicium sumat, quantacunque fidei imbecillitate laboret." ("De cœna Domini" *affirmativa*, Nos. viii. and ix., p. 601 of "Concordia, pia et unanimi Consensu," etc.)

How completely, also, Bucer's *Concordia* failed of finding acceptance among the Reformed, may be gathered from the following Lutheran testimony:—"Hoc nimirum, volunt, Corpus Christi cum pane sacramentaliter se significative unitum esse: ita ut credentes et pii homines tam certo Corpus Christi (quod sursum in cœlis sit) fide spiritualiter accipiant, quam certo panem ore manducant. Quod vero Corpus Christi in sacra Cœna in his terris substantialiter (licet invisibili et incomprehensibili modo) præsens sit, et una cum pane benedicto, ore, etiam ab hypocritis et nomine duntaxat Christianis, sumatur, id solent quasi horrendam blasphemiam damnare et execrari." (*Formula Concordiæ*, under "Solida et uberior repetitio," vii., "De Cœna Domini," in "Concordia," Lipsiæ, 1654, pp. 727, 728.)

If these things are well considered, I question whether this exceptional case will not be found to strengthen rather than to weaken the force of my argument. If, however, in this my own opinion should be warped by prejudice, or the reader should think it so to be, I will ask the reader to look carefully into the history of the matter; marking especially—(1) Luther's positive demand (though it is true he was brought to accept something less) as the necessary condition of peace,—"ut auditoribus suis probe inculcarent, quod in Cœna vere habeatur et accipiatur verum corpus et sanguis Christi: idque *non minus ab impiis quam a piis*," (see Hospinian, p. 246 *a*.) (2) Bucer's expressed feeling (and that of his associates) concerning this: "*Multa et gravia* se præbituros *scandala* ecclesiis suis, si dicerent, Impios æquè participes fieri corporis Domini, ac pios," (p. 246 *b*); again—"*Auditu horribilem* vocem in Ecclesiis suis futuram, si dicatur: Impios æque corpus Christi manducarè ac pios." (Ibid.) (3) How the Swiss, in accepting the "Concord," *muffle* the sound of the part pertaining to this point, and pass on hastily. (See p. 286 *b*.)

After carefully weighing this, I will then ask the reader to make, in consequence, what deductions he thinks right from the value of the testimonies I have here adduced.

There is one thing however (and a most important one) which the reader must, in fairness, be asked to consider well, and take into calculation, in his endeavour to arrive at the truth of this matter. It is this—that in the matter of the manducation of the *res sacramenti* by the *infideles*, it is one thing for Bucer and some of the Reformed, to have approximated in their language to the language of Luther's *affirmative*. It is quite another thing for Luther and the real Lutherans in doctrine, so to have approximated in their language to the Reformed as to lay aside their positive *affirmative* and change it into the direct *negative*. Bucer, in his desire for peace, did affirm that the *indigni* (not the *impii*) *receive*. But did Luther, or any of the Lutherans, ever deny that the *impii* eat? Did they ever declare that such "in no wise are partakers of Christ"?

It is true that Luther, for peace sake was brought to concede something of his demands,* and to be satisfied with Bucer's dictum—

* Even after Luther's concession, Bucer evidently felt the difficulty of reconciling what *he* had conceded with the views of the Reformed. His words, when commending the *Concordia* at Strasburg, were "Alterum, indignis porrigi etiam cum pane Corpus

"Indignos Corpus Domini sumere." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 248, a.) But that was obviously very different from admitting the negation of his own *dictum*—"non minus ab impiis quàm a piis." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 246, a.)

It is true also that Luther assented to the former Helvetic Confession. But that assent was modified by expressions of some sort of dissatisfaction. (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 276, a; also pp. 277, 278.)

And the question is dealt with in *that* Confession, not by any means in the distinct manner in which it is treated in the latter Confession of Helvetia, and in our own Articles.

Indeed the former Confession of Helvetia was designedly drawn up with a view to meet the requirements of the Lutherans. (See Niemeyer's Collectio Confessionum, Preface, pp. 33—35.) And the concessions made to the pacificators (Bucer and Capito) gave rise to

Domini, et sumi hoc ab eis, positum est propter verba Pauli 1 Cor. xi., qui scribit, Indigne sumentes reos fieri corporis et sanguinis Domini." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 253, b.)

There were those among our English Reformers who would have been ready to answer that what St. Paul said, he spake concerning the reception of the *Sacramentum*, not of the *Res Sacramenti*. (See e.g. Hooper, Later Writings, p. 498. Hutchinson's Works, p. 264.)

It has been well said—"Insto. Manducationis distinctionem in dignam et indignam non haberi nisi a Paulo: qui solus ejus meminit prioris ad Corinthios undecimo: sed ita ut huc non pertineat. Non enim producit ulterius, quam ad signa sacramentalia, panem et vinum. Diserta enim sunt verba, *Quisquis ederit panem hunc, et biberit hoc poculum Domini indigne, reus tenebitur corporis et sanguinis Domini.* Nota: ederit panem hunc, biberit hunc calicem: non vero, qui carnem et sanguinem. Rursus dico legi diserte, quicunque manducaverit carnem Christi habiturum vitam æternam: sed nunquam tamen, qui comederit quenquam periturum. Et quisquam ausit in oppositum?" (Chamier's Panstratiæ Catholicæ, tom. iv., p. 329, b. 1627.)

If this be so, to what purpose can it be alleged as against the natural meaning of our Article that the expressions "Partakers of Christ" and "to eat the body of Christ" are simply Scriptural expressions, and that in Scripture they signify "worthy partaking" or such partaking and such eating, whereby we dwell in Christ and Christ in us?

The question has to be asked—Does Scripture know any real partaking of Christ which is *not* such partaking? And does it tell of any eating or partaking of Christ's body without being partakers of Christ? If not, such allegations from Scripture may indeed serve to show the Scriptural character of the teaching of our Article, but they can deduct nothing from the force of its plain declaration—that such as be void of a lively faith—however they may receive the *sacramentum* to their condemnation—yet are in *no wise* partakers of Christ.

some subsequent dissatisfaction, especially in respect of the Latin version. (See Niemeyer, p. 35.)

But unless it can be shown that the Lutherans *did* (after this controversy had taken shape) admit the language of *negation* in this matter, the force of the argument from the testing character of this question, is left untouched, so far as our Article is concerned, by the example of Bucer. Bucer's example will prove, indeed, that the test was not perfect on the Lutheran side, inasmuch as modified Lutheran statements of the affirmative might sometimes be accepted by, and thus not be exclusive of the Reformed. But on the side of the Reformed, the statements of *negation* continue as unfailing a test as ever, because as exclusive as ever of Lutheran statements and Lutheran doctrine.

As to Bucer's own views the reader may be referred to Appendix xlvi. of Strype's Cranmer, p. 124, sqq., Edit. 1694, for his "Sententious sayings," which will clear him (I think) of any approach to the Real Objective Presence. (See also Hospinian iv., pp. 371, 274, 281, and Calvin's Works, vol. viii., pp. 652, 663, Amsterdam, 1667; "Consensus Orthodoxus," pp. 322, 384, 32, 33, 245, 348; Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, pp. 32, 30, 51; Bucer, "De regno Christi," pp. 57, 58, Basle, 1557.)

Let me add that the evidence adduced in this note might be materially added to, if need were. Thus e.g. (1) P. Martyr expressing his assent (1556) to the Augsburg Confession, is pressed to sign the *Concordia Witebergensis*, which he cannot do "quod per verbum Dei et conscientiam dare nequeat, destitutos verâ fide, percipiendo Sacramenta corpus Christi sumere." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 421.) (2) Calvin writing to Schalingius says "vos omnes uno consensu asserere video, quicunque ad S. Mensam accedunt, sive impii, sive fideles, substantialiter comedere Christi carnem, et sanguinem bibere." (See Ibid, p. 425.) (3) Among the theses maintained by Morlinus and Stoffelius in the Heidelberg disputation (1560) is the following—"Credimus etiam et profitemur, quod in Cœna Domini, ubi servantur verba et institutio Christi, non tantum a piis et dignis, sed etiam ab impiis, hypocritis, et infidelibus accipiatur. Hoc tamen discrimine, quod ab impiis ore tantum, a piis vero ore, fide, et corde sumatur, etc." (See Ibid, p. 474.)

(4) In the disputation of 1586, the theologians of Wirtenberg set

down, under the *first* head, *six* points on which there was consent, *two* on which there was not consent. Of these the first is stated thus—"1. Quòd Wirtenbergenses Collocutores censent in Sacramentali conjunctione . . . . inseparabiliter copulari: ac proinde ori quorumvis sive dignorum sive indignorum accedentium exhiberi." Under the *second* head, "*De perceptione Sacramentali*," *three* points of consent are set down. Then follows, "In hoc autem non est consensum. 1. Quod Wirtenbergenses . . . . credunt a quibusvis eodem oris instrumento, ... inscrutabili modo percipi, a dignis quidem ad vitam, ab indignis ad condemnationem. Alterius autem partis collocutores docent, sicut soli menti res figuratæ præbentur, ita a solis fidelibus (ut qui soli unicum illud mentis instrumentum afferant quo Christus cum suis beneficiis apprehenditur) spiritualiter percipi." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, vol. iv., pp. 649, 650. Geneva, 1581.)

(5) Calvin says, "Alterum caput controversiæ est de promiscuâ manducatione: quia nos ita asserimus omnibus offeri Christi carnem et sanguinem, ut soli fideles inæstimabili hoc thesauro fruantur . . . . Adversarii nostri corpus et sanguinem ita sub pane et vino includunt, ut sine ulla fide vorentur ab impiis." ("Admonitio ultima at Westphalium"; in Works, vol. viii., p. 699. Amsterdam, 1667.)

(6) But Calvin's treatises on this subject will be found to be full of evidence on this point. See especially vol. viii., pp. 656, 660, 674, 692, 698, 744; vol. ix., pp. 266, 256.

(7) The three last chapters of the "Consensus Orthodoxus" of Gualter are these:—

(*a*) "Responsio ad Argumentum de Corporali præsentia, ex verbis cœnæ, etc."

(*b*) "Responsio ad usitatum Argumentum de manducatione indignorum."

(*c*) "Quomodo indigni manducare dicantur Corpus Christi, et de duplici ejus apud patres appellatione."

At the end, p. 409, among sayings of Luther, which can no wise be reconciled with truth, we have, "VIII. Sacramentarios et Suermeros esse omnes, qui non credunt panem Dominicum in Cœnâ esse, ipsum verum et naturale Corpus Christi, quod impius Judas æque bene oraliter accepit, ac S. Petrus."

(8) The 8th of the Articles of Torgau declares that "non tantum

beneficium Christi, sed etiam ipsum verum corpus una cum pane ore accipiatur, sive cum fide, sive sine fide signa illa accipiantur." (See especially Hospinian's observations on this in Concordia Discors. Works. vol. v., p. 47.)

(9) The *Formula Concordiæ* declares—"Credimus, docemus et confitemur, non solum vere fideles et dignos, sed etiam indignos et infideles, verum corpus et sanguinem Christi, non tamen ad vitam et consolationem, sed ad judicium et condemnationem percipere, si non emendentur et resipiscant." And it condemns those who teach "Quod Corpus Christi in sacra cœna non oraliter cum pane, sed tantum panis et vinum ore, corpus autem Christi *spiritualiter tantum fide* percipiatur." It condemns also those who teach "Quod increduli et impœnitentes Christiani in sacra cœna, non verum corpus et sanguinem Christi, sed tantùm panem et vinum percipiant." (See Hospinian, vol. v., pp. 126, 127.)

Could there be a much more direct and distinct condemnation of our Articles? Have we not in the two Formularies (Lutheran and English) declarations, and statements, and teachings of Eucharistic doctrine—*adversis frontibus pugnantia?*

(10) Among the "Articuli Visitatorii (1592) in Electoratu et provinciis superioris Saxoniæ publicati," under Articulus I., the sixth head declares, "Quod oralis perceptio corporis et sanguinis Christi non solum fiat a dignis, verum etiam ab indignis, qui sine pœnitentia et vera fide accedunt." And in the same Articles, under the "Falsa et Erronea doctrina Calvinistarum," the sixth head, under "De Sacra Cœna," is set down thus—"Quod soli digni illud accipiant, indigni autem, qui talem fidem evolantem sursus in cœlos non habent, nihil præter panem et vinum accipiant."

Perhaps the following extract from the *Formula Concordiæ* may be regarded as rendering any further evidence superfluous—

"*Status Controversiæ, quæ est inter nos et Sacramentarios, in hac Articulo.*

"Quæritur, an in sacra cœna verum corpus et verus sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi vere et substantialiter sint præsentia, atque cum pane et vino distribuantur, et ore sumantur, ab omnibus illis, quo hoc Sacramento utuntur: sivi digni, sivi indigni, boni aut mali, fideles aut infideles: ita tamen, ut fideles e cœna Domini consolationem et vitam percipiant: infideles autem eam at judicium

sumant. Cingliani hanc præsentiam et dispensationem corporis et sanguinis Christi in sacra cœna negant: nos vero eandem asseveramus." ("De Cœna Dom.," p. 597 of "Concordia. Pia et unananimi Consensu, etc.")

The following extract from Archdeacon Hardwick will doubtless carry with it weight—

"The controversy was no longer touching the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, nor of His actual communication then and there to every faithful recipient. So far the Lutheran and Calvinist were now agreed; yet, while the former taught that Christ was present in the elements, and so connected with them after consecration, that *even the wicked* to their detriment became *partakers* of His glorified humanity, the latter contended no less strenuously that Christ is not communicated *in* or *through*, but rather *with* the consecrated bread and wine; the union of the outward and inward parts of the Sacrament being always *conditioned* by the *faith* of the recipient." (Reformation, p. 167.)

If, however, it had been said that *the reception of the inward part* had been thus conditioned, the view of the Reformed would have been, I think, more accurately represented. By virtue of the Sacramental union the inward part was held to be always *offered*, even when, for lack of faith, the soul of the recipient could not receive it.

Dean Goode has justly observed—"For the great question which has always divided the two main schools of doctrine in this matter—that is, those who have held a substantial presence of the body of Christ in, or with, or under the form of the elements, and those who have denied it—has been, whether the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith only or the mouth. The former have held it to be the mouth, considering faith to be only necessary for securing certain benefits from the reception, not for the reception itself: the latter, with the Article, have held it to be faith." (Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 647.)

Note D, p. 669.

Mr. Sedley Taylor says, I think, very truly, "the body of Christ is given. taken, and eaten in the supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith—When in the first sentence the body of Christ is spoken of as 'given, taken, and eaten in the supper,' we must, I think, understand the same kind of reception intended as is expressed by 'received, and eaten in the supper' in the second. This identity of subject is still clearer in the Latin forms of the two paragraphs. . . . The close parallelism of expression* in these clauses would I think, alone suffice to show that the two 'manducations' are identical. In order, however, to have no doubt upon the point, I will prove that the Reformers were accustomed to speak of eating spiritually as equivalent to eating by faith." (Letter to the Author of Kiss of Peace, pp. 13. 14.)

Then after citing from Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper and Jewel he concludes that the interpretation must be as follows, "The body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only through the faith of the recipients;" "or," he adds, "to use Jewell's words just quoted 'The body of Christ is to be eaten by faith only, and none otherwise.'" (Page 15.)

Peter Martyr, in his teaching at Oxford, distinctly makes "manducatio spiritualis" to be equivalent to "manducatio per fidem, saying "Cum ibi sit manducatio tantum *spiritualis*, id est *per fidem*, qua suscipiatur verum corpus et sanguis Christi." (Loci Communes. vol. i., p. 1570, Basle, 1580.) The whole tenor of Reformed

* R. Ford, speaking of the 29th Article, says—"Ut viderimus in Articulo immediate præcedenti, Corpus et Sanguinem Christi non carnaliter, sed spiritualiter in Sacramento manducari et bibi: Sequitur, personam spiritualem, et non carnalem, ex illo participem esse posse. Quia, licet persona spiritualis carnaliter aliquid faciat, tamen persona carnalis nunquam aliquid facere potest spiritualiter.

Articulus hoc est prioris consectarium. Nam quum fides est medium manducationis sacramentalis, ut impii, quibus non est fides, Christi sint participes impossibile est." (Ford on the 39 Articles, p. 288, London, 1720. The latter part is quoted from Welchman. See also Veneer on the 39 Articles, vol. ii., pp. 664, 665, London, 1730.)

Theology, both at home and abroad,* may be said, I think, to support this interpretation. Cranmer says "Christ's body cannot be eaten but *spiritually*, by *believing* and remembering Christ's benefits." (On Lord's Supper, p. 204.)

So again Cranmer says "All is *spiritually with faith*, not with mouth." (Page 15.)

So Hooper believes this receiving to be "Spiritually . . . through a true and lively faith." (Later Writings, p. 49.)

So Jewel, "Spiritually and with the mouth of our faith we eat, etc. . . . The body of Christ is to be eaten by faith only, and none otherwise." (Sermon and Harding, pp. 448, 449.)

And again Jewel says, "The *spiritual* eating . . . *by faith* is the *true* eating." (Sermon and Harding, p. 468.)

So Hutchinson, "This *spiritual* receipt, which is *by faith*. . . . God's Holy Word knoweth *no other* receipt." (Works, p. 263.)

So Archbishop Sandys, "*Spiritually, by faith*, we feed upon Christ." (Sermons, p. 89.)

So in Nowell's Smaller Catechism language almost identical with that in the Article, is followed almost immediately by the words "spiritualiter per fidem" thus "Corpus et sanguis Christi, quæ *fidelibus* cœna Dominica *præbentur*, ab illis que *accipiuntur, comeduntar*, et bibuntur, *cœlesti tantum et spirituali* modo, verè tamen atque

* So Bullinger, "Neque . . . corporaliter editur, sed spiritualiter, id est, per fidem." (De Origine erroris. Fo. 185 b, Zurich, 1539.)

So the Later Confession of Helvetia, "quod percipiatur . . . spiritualiter per fidem." (Harmonia Confessionum, p. 110, Geneva, 1581) "received spiritually by faith." (Hall's Harmony, p. 318.)

So Ursinus, "Corpus Christi est præsens in cœna, id est, communicatur nobis, scilicet *per fidem* seu *spiritualiter*." (Theses de Cœna Domini, in Works, vol. i., p. 787. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

And again, "Certum est hanc [bibitionem] non nisi *spiritualem* esse, id est, per *solam fidem* fieri. Non igitur Sanguis Christi bibitur corporaliter, a piis et impiis." (Ibid, p. 788.)

And again, "Carnem vero et sanguinem suum, item suo modo, hoc est, *spiritualiter, vera fide* [Christus] . . . edendum et bibendum tradat." (Confessio fidei Theologorum Heidelb. De S. Cœna Dom. in Ursinus's Works, vol. ii., p. 415.)

And again, "Spirituale in Sacramentis est, quod solâ fide, corde . . . accipitur." (Works, vol. ii., p. 1383)

So the Augsburg ministers explain this meaning thus, "manducatione spirituali, hoc est, fide." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, Part ii., 1533, in Works, vol. iv., p. 217. Geneva, 1681.)

reipsa: adeo quidem ut veluti panis sustentandi corpora, sic corpus Christi animas nostras *spiritualiter per fidem* pascendi maximam habet facultatem." (See Forde on the 39 Articles, p. 276. London, 1720.)

So Bishop Morton, uniting the teaching of the two Articles thus, "The Church of England in her 28 and 29 Article saith thus: The body of Christ is given to be eaten in this Sacrament only after a *spiritual* manner, *even by* faith; wherein the wicked, and such as be void of faith, eat it not: although they do visibly press with their teeth the Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, yet are they in no wise partakers thereof." (On Eucharist, book v., chap. 2, sect. i., p. 311.)

So Bishop Bayly speaks of the "soul that *spiritually* receives Him *by faith*." (Practice of Piety, pp. 482, 1668.) And again he says, "Whosoever drinketh it [Christ's blood] *spiritually by faith* . . . . shall surely have the remission of his sins." (Ibid, p. 485.)

So Bishop Horsley, "The Church of England . . . denies not, but explicitly maintains, that 'the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper,' —though they are taken 'after a spiritual manner;' and 'the mean by which they are received is faith.'" (Charges, pp. 162, 163. Edit. 1813.)

"The Latin runs thus: 'Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in Cœna, tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione.' So that the English might just as well have been 'is given, *received*, and eaten. But according to the Article, both English and Latin, the *reception* is only through the medium of faith, and in a heavenly and spiritual manner. The *taking* therefore of the English Article must also be so understood. The faithful must be those who *receive* or *take* in a heavenly and spiritual manner—those who have true faith." (Bishop of Llandaff's Charge, 1869, p. 145.)

Lutherans indeed did use, not uncommonly, the word* *cœlestis* (as

* Indeed after the developement of the doctrine of *ubiquity*, and that "the right hand of God is everywhere," the high Lutherans are represented as teaching "Corpus Christi corporali modo non esse in cœlo, sed in omnibus creaturis *cœlesti modo* juxta quem omnibus creaturis æque præsens sit ac Deitati." (See Hospinian, Concordia Discors, in Works, vol. v., p. 365 a, Geneva, 1678. See also vol. iv., p. 60, b.)

well as *spiritualis*) *without the* TANTUM,* as applied to the mode. (See e.g. Hospinian, vol. v. p. 139.) And of such use of the word Ursinus says—"Ait, esse modum *cœlestem*. Atque *in cœlo* non manducatur ore corporis: et corpus Christi versatur ibi tantum visibiliter, palpabiliter, circumscripte et localiter, neque ingreditur aut existit intra hominum corpora. Si ergo cœlestis est iste præsentiæ et manducationis modus, non est oralis, neque impiis communis." (Ursinus in Works, vol. ii., p. 1180. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

Again he says, "Rideat universam orthodoxam Ecclesiam, quæ in celebratione cœnæ, Sursum corda et mentes se habere ad Dominum, semper publica et solenni voce clamavit. Rideat denique seipsum et totum suum gregem, qui VOLENS NOLENS *fateri cogitur*, Cœnam Domini esse actionem non tam terrenam quam *cœlestem*. . . . Quid est universum Ecclesiæ ministerium, nisi scala quædam, nos ad Christum in cœlum attollens?" (Ibid, p. 1190.)

For further answer to the arguments of the Ritualists drawn from the expression "given, taken, and eaten," I refer the reader to Paper No. VI., pp. 391—397, and 401—407, and especially pp. 393, 394.

I will add here† that (1) the claim of a necessarily objective sense

* But the assertion of our Article *with the* TANTUM is a contradiction in terms of Lutheran statements. See above, p. 670.

† I. As to the fact of the teaching by the Reformed of the real *giving* of the *res sacramenti*, I can scarcely think further evidence to be required. The following, however, may be added here.

(1) "Et Œcolampadius satis superque testatus est, ipsum quoque Domini corpus nobis in cœna præsens exhiberi, verum ita, ut Chrysostomus, ut Patres reliqui crediderunt, nudæ animæ et puræ menti, eique in cœlestia sublevatæ." (Bucer in letter to Pontanus. See "Historia Comitiorum MDXXX. Augustæ Celebratorum," vol. ii., fo. 301 b.)

(2) So Bullinger:—"Signa divinitus instituta de manibus ministorum tanquam de ipsis Dei manibus accipiunt [fideles] tanquam vera et cœlestia Dei dona, quorum efficaciam, nisi fide careant, sentiunt." (De Origine Erroris, fo. 189 b; Zurich, 1539.)

(3) Again:—"Corporis et sanguinis domini sacramenta sunt, per quæ nobis annunciat et attestatur quid *ipse* nobis *donet*." (De Origine Erroris, fo. 190; Zurich, 1539.)

(4) "Credo et confiteor, in sacra Christi Domini nostri Cœna, quotiescunque illa secundum ipsius institutionem celebratur, credentibus (quibus solis cœnâ hæc est instituat) non minus, quam discipulis in prima cœna, verum, traditumque et crucifixum Christi Corpus una cum omnibus ejus cœlestibus thesauris et donis, quæ sua morte suis acquisivit, ut sit famelicæ ipsorum animæ cibus, et suum sanguinem, quem in remissionem peccatorum effudit, ut sit potus, a Christo ipso *porrigi*, et *distribui*." (Confessio Fidei Principis D. Friderici III. Pii, Comitis Palatini—in Works of Ursinus, vol. ii., p. 455; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612. Also in Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum, pp. 132. 153; Geneva, 1654.)

for the word "eaten" cannot stand for a moment before any acquaint-

(5) "Dominus visibile illud symbolum nobis porrigendo, *una* DAT *etiam nobis* suum corpus." (Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

(6) "Illud mihi est extra controversiam, veritatem hic cum suo signo conjunctam esse: hoc est, non minus vere nos, quantum ad vim spiritualem attinet, participes corporis Christi fieri quam pane veseimur." (Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

(7) "Non simpliciter hic *datur* nobis Corpus Christi, sed *in cibum*." (Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

(8) "Accipite et manducate; sensus verborum est, Communicando in fractione panis secundum ordinem et ritum a me præceptum, participes quoque corporis mei critis." (Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

(9) "When the minister bringeth towards thee the bread thus blessed and broken, and offering it unto thee, bids thee, *Take, eat, etc.*, then meditate that Christ Himself cometh unto thee, and both offereth, and *giveth indeed* unto thy faith, *His very body and blood*, with all the merits of His death and passion . . . . The bread of the Lord is given by the minister, but the bread which *is the Lord* is *given* by Christ Himself." (Bishop Bayly's "Practice of Piety," pp. 481, 482. London, 1668.)

(10) "The truth is not absent from the sign, neither doth Christ deceive when He saith, This is my body; but He *giveth* Himself indeed to every soul that *spiritually* receives Him by faith." (Ibid., p. 482.)

[What will modern Presbyterians think of the allegation, that to teach of a real *giving* of the body of Christ in the Supper must mean, or ought to mean, the teaching of the Real Objective Presence—that to believe in the *gift* must imply the Adorable Presence of the body and blood under the forms of bread and wine?

But do any Presbyterians believe or teach any such gift?

Let Dr. H. Bonar give answer. "*The giving.* In many ways Christ gave Himself to us; but here it is especially as the sin-bearer that He does so. It is His *broken* body that He presents to us. This is His gift to us. That broken body, with the sin-bearing work which it accomplished, He *gives* to us. It is the gift of His love; the love that passeth knowledge." (Light and Truth: The Gospels, p. 256.)]

II. If further evidence be desired as to the teaching of reality of the THING *(the Res Sacramenti)* thus given, the following may be added:—

(1) "Verus ergo et vivificus animæ cibus est caro Christi, verus et salutaris potus est sanguis Christi, atque hic adeo verus et unicus animæ cibus et potus est, ut post hunc anima fidelis alium non cupiat . . . . Quæris, Quodam modo edere possis carnem Christi veram de virgine natam, et sanguinem qui de latere fluxit? Certo enim constat de his in præsentiarum loqui Dominum. Respondeo, CIBUM *quidem non esse* SPIRITUALEM. *Veram* enim *carnem verumque sanguinem* habet Dominus, unde edendi percipiendique *ratio* spiritualis est." (Bullinger *De Origine Erroris*, fol. 185. Zurich, 1539.)

(2) So Ursinus, "Ergo in cœna Corpus Christi verum et corporeum, carneum et osseum, *non nisi spiritualiter* manducatur. *Objectum* CORPORALE *est:* ergo *acceptio* SPIRITUALIS *est*." (Consideratio Commonefactionis Chytræi de S. Dom. Cœna, in Works of Ursinus, vol. ii., p. 1179. Edit. Reuter. Heidelberg, 1612.)

(3) "Certo cognoscitur . . . . omnes credentes, non modo beneficiorum Christi omnium fieri participes, verum etiam, quia Christus hoc promisit et hac cœna testatum voluit, ipsam *corporis et sanguinis Christi substantiam, non minus* VERE *ac* CERTO, quam visibilem panem ac vinum edendum et bibendam eis *dari*." (Ursinus, *De Cœna Domini*, in Works, vol. i., p. 816. Edit. Reuter. Heidelberg, 1612.)

ance with the writings of the Reformers, either Continental or

(4) "*Quid est cœna Domini?*

"Est distributio et sumtio panis et vini in congregatione fidelium, facta ad recordationem Christi, instituta a Christo ut ipse hoc signo testetur, se *certissime fidelibus*, hanc panem et hoc vinum sumentibus, *corpus et sanguinem suam* ad vitam æternam *communicare*, ut fœdus in baptismo cum Deo initum, perpetuo illis ratum sit.

". . . . *Est ne manducare Christum tantum meriti Christi et donorum spiritus sancti participem fieri?*

"Non hoc tantum est: sed etiam ipsius Christi *personæ et substantiæ* communicatio. Divinitas enim ipsius in nobis habitat. *Corpus* autem ipsius ita *nostris corporibus copulatur*, ut unum cum ipso simus." (Larger Catechism of Ursinus, in Works, vol. i., p. 31. Heidelberg, 1612. Edit. Reuter.)

(5) "*Quis ergo sensus est verborum Christi, cum dicit panem esse corpus et vinum esse sanguinem suum?*

"Panem hunc fractum et a nobis manducatem, et vinum hoc a nobis haustum, credentibus esse signum ac testimonium, *corpus et sanguinem Christi* pro nobis esse traditum et fusum, et *nobis* PER FIDEM *communicari*, tam certo, quam panem et vinum sumimus ore corporis." (Ibid, p. 32.)

(6) "Scriptura testatur, neque substantiæ Christi sine beneficiis, neque beneficiorum ejus absque substantia, quenquam posse fieri participem." (Ursinus, *De cœna Domini*, vol. i,, p. 815; see also p. pp. 818, 819, 827; vol. ii., pp. 78, 614, 1085.)

(7) "Præterea audio quid verba sonent: neque enim mortis tantum ac resurrectionis suæ beneficium nobis offert Christus, sed corpus ipsum in quo passus est ac resurrexit. Concludo, realiter, (ut vulgo loquuntur) hoc est, vere nobis in cœna dari Christi corpus, ut sit animis nostris in cibum salutarem. Loquor vulgari more: sed intelligo substantia corporis pasci animas nostras." (Calvin on 1 Cor. xi. 24; see also extracts from Calvin in Cosin's Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. iv., pp. 167, 168.)

(8) "I hold . . . . that the real and substantial body of Christ is only in heaven, but yet that faithful communicants do, by faith and in a spiritual manner, verily receive His very body and very blood, which for us was delivered unto the cross. Wherefore I can by no means admit either transubstantiation or consubstantiation in the bread and wine of the Supper. (Peter Martyr's Declaration at Poissy, as given in Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, p. 425.)

(9) "When mention is made in these formulæ of the substance of the body of Christ I understand by that name or word nothing else than the true body of Christ. For our faith is not directed towards a feigned object or phantom, but the true natural human body, which the Word of God took of the blessed Virgin, and gave unto the cross for us. Wherefore there is no reason why we should from that Word be concluded to hold that the Real Presence is anywhere else than in heaven." (Ibid, p. 425.)

(10) "The Sacramental bread and wine therefore are not bare signifying signs, but such as wherewith Christ *doth indeed exhibit and give* to every worthy receiver, not only His Divine virtue and efficacy, but *also His very body and blood*." (Bishop L. Bayly's "Practice of Piety, p. 445. London, 1668.) "Not that Christ is brought down from heaven to the Sacrament, but that the Holy Spirit by the Sacrament lifts up his mind unto Christ." (Ibid, p. 444.)

III. Again, if further evidence be required of the teaching by the Reformed of the *real* eating and drinking (though *spiritual* only) let these examples suffice.

English. (See above, Paper No. VI., pp. 385, sqq., and 395, sqq., and No. V., p. 235.)

(1) The following is a Question and Answer from a curious English Reformed "Short Catechism: a brief and godly bringing up of youth," from the press (it is said) of Froschover, at Zurich, "Imprynted the yeare after the creation of the world, 5525, and after the byrthe of oure Saviour, 1550."

"*T. What eate we in the Supper?*

"Ch. The faithfull eateth breade and drinketh wyne with the mouthe, but inwardly in his devout mynde he *eateth* the *body* of Christ, and *drinketh* Hys *bloude*, if he believe that Jesus dyed for hym on the crosse, and shedde Hys bloude for him, he eateth the bread of lyfe whereof the outward breade putteth him in remembrance. The unfaithfull eateth bread and drinketh wyne, he useth the tokens outwardly but inwardly he receiveth not the strength and frute thereof." (i. 6, 7.)

(2) In another part of the same Catechism (II. 8, on Lord's Prayer) we are taught, "He [Christ] fedeth oure soules with Hys fleshe, and geveth us Hys bloude to drinke, when He geveth us Hys Spirite that we beleve that He gave Hys bodye to the crosse for oure redemption, and Hys bloude to washe awaye oure synnes." [With these words the reader may compare the words of Cranmer, in the Preface to his work on the Lord's Supper (published the same year as this Catechism) "He [Christ] it is that feedeth continually all that belong unto Him, with His own flesh that hanged upon the cross, and giveth them drink of the blood flowing out of His own side." The Catechism concludes with a Prayer for King Edward.]

(3) "Sacramentum non est signum tantum: sed confit duobus, signo videlicet visibili terrenove, et re significata cœlesti et divina. . . . Cum cibus ille in mensa domini propositus duplicis generis sit: est enim cibus corporalis et spiritualis, terrenus et cœlestis, visibilis et invisibilis: colligitur sane et manducationem esse duplicem, corporalem et spiritualem, terrenam et cœlestem, visibilem et invisibilem." (Bullinger *De Origine Erroris.* Fo. 193, Zurich, 1539.)

(4) "Quemadmodum panis et vinum ista non efficiunt nisi ille edatur et hoc bibatur, ita corpus et sanguis Domini tantas virtutes in homine non exerent nisi etiam istud edatur et hic bibatur. Hinc vero est quod Dominus dixit, Accipite, dividite inter vos, edite, et bibete: cogitat ergo de modo edendi et bibendi fidelis. . . . Quod pane et vino repræsentatur, animam non corpus alit nutritque, et cibus est spiritualis, ipsum inquam Corpus Domini traditum pro nobis in mortem, et sanguis Domini in remissionem peccatorum effusus: intelligit ergo hoc spiritualiter edendum, et sanguinem ejus spiritualiter esse bibendum." (Bullinger De Origine Erroris. Fo. 193 b, Zurich, 1539.)

(5) Ursinus speaking of the calumnies under which the Reformed were oppressed, says, "quasi corpus et sanguinem Christi vere in cœna Domini manducari et bibi, nos inficiaremur." (De cœna Domini, in Works, vol. i., p. 818. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.) And he adds, "Christi enim corpus et sanguinem in cœna ipsius non solum esse, sed verè etiam edi et bibi, ex verbo Dei certo cognoscimus, idque mente et voce coram Deo, et omnibus angelis, et hominibus confitemur." (Ibid, p. 819.)

(6) Bishop Davenant says—"Fundamentale est, *Panem et vinum esse a Christo constituta media per quæ rite manducantes hunc panem benedictum et bibentes hoc vinum, manducent vivificam carnem Christi, et bibant ejus salutiferum sanguinem, ad salutem animarum.* Nota est *omnium* Evangelicorum in hoc capite *concordia:* non est itaque laborandum in ea probanda." (Ad Pacem Eccl. Adhortatio, p. 133. Cambridge, 1640.)

Peter Martyr says, "In Sacramento manducari Spiritualiter, sed vere, Carnem Christi, concedimus." (Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1608. Basle, 1580. See the Context.)

Zwingle writes (1527) "Dicamus, non carnaliter edi, sed spiritualiter. Dicamus igitur spiritualiter edi Christi Corpus." (In "Epistolæ doctorum virorum, quibus cum Eucharistiæ et Anabaptismi negotium, tùm alia religionis Capita. . . . . Continentur." Fo. 122a, 1548.)

(2) That the claim of such a sense for the word "*received*" is

(7) "Tu ne putes Christum in nostris Ecclesiis sacra cœna exeludi, solumque panem et vinum, inania symbola administrari. Utinam nosses optime Lector, quam istuc *abominatus semper sit pater et præceptor noster* Joannes Œcolampadius. Sed sicut transitus Domini nostri Jesu Christi in cœlos, hoc tantum infert, jam Dominum hic non agere ratione hujus sæculi; ita scito nobis nihil negari, quam Christum non naturaliter et ratione hujus sæculi uniri cum pane, vel in pane includi localiter. Cæterum *verum corpus, verum sanguinem* Domini, ipsum verum Christum Deum et hominem nobis in cœna *adesse*, ipsiusque verbis et symbolis exhiberi *in cibum* non periturum carnis, sed sempiternum animæ: eoque non sensu aut ratione, sed *vera fide percipiendum*." (Bucer's Introduction to the Letters of Zuingle and Œcolampadius—"Epistolæ Doctorum Virorum," 1548.)

(8) "Cum magna animi alacritate ac gratiarum actione asserimus, vere *pasci* et refici animas vero illo corpore et sanguine . . . . atque ita semper testati sumus adesse Christum ipsum in cœna." (Œcolampadius in "Epistolæ Doctorum Virorum." Fol. 128 a.)

(9) "Vere dicitur fidem alicui dedisse, et falso negatur dedisse, si quis promittendo cuipiam dexteram porrexerit, et audiat: Dextera est fides: quamvis non sit substantialiter fides, neque in manu, vel in annulo sedes fidei sit, sed in pectore potius. Certus autem fit qui dextram accipit, de fide, quum dextra symbolum fidei sit. Ita nos quoque quam sciamus Christum affirmasse de pane, quod sit corpus suum quod pro vobis et nobis datur: minime hæsitemus, quod pro nobis corpus mortuum sit, et proinde gratias agentes spiritualiter reficimur, *vereque manducamus carnem* Christi: cujus *carnis* spiritu, quia caro nostra facta est, vegetamur: insuper et per eam æternam vitam nos indepturos confidimus, fitque panis quem frangimus *vere communicatio* non solum corporis Christi, sed et participatio vitæ æternæ." (Œcolampadius in "Epistolæ Doctorum Virorum." Fol. 184, a.)

(10) Even the Lutherans acknowledged (as they could not deny) that such language *was* the language of the maturer views of the Reformed. So the "solida, plana, ac perspicua Repetitio" which is appended to the *Formula Concordiæ*, thus states what it regards as the later doctrine of the Reformed—"Affirmarunt atque jactitarunt: se plane nihil aliud sentire, quam quod Dominus Jesus Christus vere, substantialiter, vivus in sacra sua cœna præsens sit. Hoc autem intelligunt ipsi, tantum de divina Christi natura, non autem de ipsius carne et sanguine. De his autem sentiunt, ea tantum in cœlis et præterea nullibi esse: ideoque Christum nobis cum pane et vino VERUM *corpus et* VERUM *sanguinem* MANDUCANDUM ET BIBENDUM DARE, *spiritualiter, per fidem sed non corporaliter ore* SUMENDUM." (See "Concordia, pia et unanimi consensu repetita confessio fidei et Doctrinæ, etc." Lipsiæ, 1654, p. 727.)

equally inconsistent with any knowledge of the language of the Reformation. (See Forbes on Articles, vol. ii., p. 558, and above Paper, No. VI., pp. 385, sqq., and 393, also Hooper, Later Writings, p. 479.)

Cranmer says, "I have written in more than an hundred places, that we *receive* the selfsame body of Christ, that was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified and buried, that rose again, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty. And the *contention* is *only* in the manner and form HOW we receive it." (On Lord's Supper, p. 370.)

Peter Martyr says, "Intelligemus . . . . fideles in cœna Domini, ore corporis *accipere* panem et vinum: mente vers et spiritu, *Corpus* et *sanguinem Christi*, prout in cruce data fuerunt pro nostra salute." (Loci Communes, vol. i,. p. 1314. Basle, 1580.)

Calvin declares, "With *one voice* we ALL *confess* that when we do according to the institution of the Lord, *receive* the Sacrament with faith, we *are undoubtedly made partakers of* the *substance* of the body and blood of Christ." (In Coverdale's Works, P.S. Edit. vol. i., p. 465.)

(3) That the claim of such a sense, (see Forbes on Articles, vol. ii., p. 558, and Knox's Remains, vol. ii., p. 193, Edit. third), for the word "taken" (*a*) is not only refuted by the fact of its being a translation of the word "accipitur," which is rendered again immediately after by "received," but (*b*) even adding to the word "*received*" all the meaning which can possibly be added by the word "taken," is sufficiently answered by the frequent appeal of the Reformers to the language of St. Augustine, as expressing their views—"Quomodo *tenebo* absentem; . . . fidem mitte et *tenuisti*."

The following example from Jewel may suffice:—"We say not . . . that Christ's body is let down from heaven, or made really or fleshly present in the sacrament. We are taught, according to the doctrine of the old fathers, to lift up our hearts to heaven, and there to feed upon the Lamb of God. . . . . St. Augustine . . . . saith *Quomodo tenebo absentem? Quomodo in cœlum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte et tenuisti:* 'How shall I *take hold* of him, being absent? How shall I reach up my hand into heaven, and *hold* him sitting there? Send up thy faith, and *thou hast* TAKEN *him.*' Thus spiritually and with the mouth of our faith we eat the body of

Christ and drink His blood, even as verily as His body was verily broken, and His blood verily shed upon the cross." (Sermon and Harding, p. 448.)

Compare the following from Bishop Hooper, "Sed neoterici . . . . fingunt Christi humanitatem invisibiliter latere in terris sub speciabus panis et vini; contra manifesta testimonia omnium Evangelistarum et Apostolorum, ac etiam D. Augustini, qui dicit *Fidem mitte, ac tenuisti:* ac si dixisset, Post assumptionem Carnis Christi in Cœlum non opus est ut manum mittas in Cœlum, quo illum *teneas.* O si ista verba neoterici diligenter perpenderent! Si autem Augustinus credidisset Corporis Christi realem præsentiam in Eucharistia, quam apposite potuisset dicere, MANUM *ministri ad altare astantis contemplare, et illic Christum latentem sub speciebus panis et vini invenias et* TENEAS! Vel sic dixisset, *Recipe panem sanctum et consecratum; et sub ejus forma Christum ore percipies.* . . . Sed pius Augustinus omnem corporalem præsentiam a Judæis tollit, sic inquiens: 'Parentes tui tenuerunt carne, tu *tene* corde; quoniam Christus absens etiam præsens est: nisi præsens esset, a nobis *teneri* non posset.' Non dicit Augustinus ad Judæum, *Parentes tui tenuerunt carne et* carnali modo; sed *carne* simpliciter. Nec dicit, *Tu corporaliter Christum corde tene;* sed simpliciter dicit, *Corde tene.* hoc est, ut antea dixit, *Mitte fidem, et tenuisti;* it est, *crede in Jesum Christum; et illum* TENES, et *ipsi te tenet.*" (Later Writings, pp. 489, 490. With this the reader may compare Dr. Pusey's Sermon, "Presence of Christ in the Eucharist," p. 22, and Newman, as there quoted in note, pp. 24, 25.)

Ridley says, that Christ "is *holden* of the godly, such as communicate Him, not only sacramentally with the hand of the body, but much more wholesomely with the *hand* * of the *heart*, and by inward drinking is received.' (Works, P.S. Edit. p. 223.)

* See Wordsworth's Note on Μὴ μοῦ ἅπτου, John xx. 17. "One of the purposes," says Bishop Wordsworth, "of His *absence*, and of His ascension into heaven, was to elicit and to exercise *that* touch, [or as it is explained above, that *fastening on to*, or *clinging to*,] by which alone He can now be touched, and by which He must be touched, if *virtue is to go out of* Him to heal us,—the touch of *faith*."

Canon Norris (in his valuable "*Catechist's Manual*," Longmans, p. 57) says, "For this same reason—to show that effort on our part is necessary—the Catechism inserts the word '*taken*' before the word '*received*.' As the bread and wine are not received unless the hand be reached forth to take them, so what Christ offers is not received unless the *hand of faith* be reached forth to *take* it. This is the teaching of the 28th Article."

It may be added, that Grindal explains his teaching of *spiritual reception*, by the words "received and *taken*," thus,—"Whosoever will be relieved by the body of Christ, must *receive* Him as He will be received, with the *instrument of faith* appointed thereto, not with teeth or mouth. And whereas I say that Christ's body *must be* RECEIVED *and* TAKEN *with his faith*, I mean not that you should pluck down Christ from heaven, and put Him in your faith, as in a visible place, etc." (Remains, p. 46.) See also the quotation from Sibbes, in Paper No. VI., p. 347, and from other Puritan divines, in pp. 328, 329, 330, 332, 333.)

(4) That the claims of such a sense,—(see Bishop Hamilton's charge, p. 81) for the word "given" breaks down completely before such examples as these.

(*a*) Calvin says, "The Lord doth in very deed *give* the same thing that he doth represent." (Calvin in Coverdale, Fruitful Lesson, etc., p. 461.) "Christ *giveth* unto us the very substance of His body and blood." (Ibid, p. 441.) "He truly *gives* and confers it [His body.]" (Calvin in Cosin's Works, vol. iv., p. 168.)

(*b*) Cranmer says, "He *giveth* His own flesh spiritually to feed upon." (On Lord's Supper, p. 35.)

(*c*) Jewell says, "Our doctrine, grounded upon God's Holy Word, is this, that as certainly as Christ gave His body upon the cross, so certainly He *giveth* now the selfsame body unto the faithful; . . . . . therefore St. Ambrose writeth thus:—*Quid petis, O Judæe? ut tribuat tibi panem, quem* DAT *omnibus*, DAT *quotidie*, DAT *semper*." (Sermon and Harding, pp. 449, 450.)

(*d*) Hooper, in the very next Article to that in which he had declared his belief that "we do verily and indeed *receive* His body and blood," speaks of the "*res sacramenti*" as "given" to faith, thus "I believe that this receiving is not done carnally or bodily, but spiritually, through a true and lively faith; that is to say, the body and blood of Christ are *not given to the mouth* and belly for the

I have very little doubt that Canon Norris is quite right. An examination of the quotation in No. VI. will, I think, lead to the conclusion that the word "*taken*" in the Catechism points (by Sacramental analogy) specially to the office of faith as the soul's *hand*, and the word "received" to the office of faith as the soul's *mouth*. (See above, Paper No. VI., pp. 385—387, 338, 339. Compare also Archbishop Ussher, as quoted in p. 424, and contrast quotations in pp. 391, 392.)

nourishing of the body, *but unto our faith*, for the nourishing of the spirit and inward man." (Later writings, p. 49.)

(*e*) Let it be added, that the Tetrapolitan Confession (drawn up by the pacific Bucer for those who, by their* dissent from the Eucharistic doctrine of Luther, thought themselves, at that time, deterred

* Dissenting, however, from the Confession of Augsburg—"verbis potius, ut aiebant, quam reipsa." Seckendorf adds—"Putabant enim, Lutherum et socios Pontificium dogma transubstantiatione non integre deposuisse, et plus justo tribuere elementis panis et vini: alii causabantur, verba Confessionis germanicæ . . . . . *sub specie panis et vini* transubstantiationem secum ferre." (Historia Lutheranismi, lib. ii., sect. 34, § lxxvii., Anno 1530, pp. 198, 199; Leipsic, 1694. On the Difference between the German and Latin Editions: see Pusey, "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 337, sqq.)

Seckendorf adds—"Vocabula illa *species* in conventione Marpurgensi anno 1529, art. xv., absque omni offensa ab utraque parte admissa fuerat, satis gnaris Helvetiis, quod Lutherus et socii non accidens illud scholasticum, sed elementa ipsa seu substantiam panis et vini sub *specie* intelligerent." (Page 199a.)

Ursinus, maintaining that there is no real repugnance between the teaching of the Reformed and that of the Augsburg Confession, says—"Porro, quod in Germanicis exemplaribus legitur, corpus et sanguinem Christi sub specie panis et vini adesse in cœna, id nihil sublevat adversarios. Tametsi enim *recte docentes* in Ecclesia, et antiquitùs et *nunc aliquando* sic loquuntur, ut *in* vel *sub* visibilibus rebus, videlicet pane et vino, *dicant Christi corpus et sanguinem sumi;* sicut nimirum in vel sub mysteriis et symbolis res significatæ, ut Christus *sub petra* et *manna*. Spiritus et sanguis Christi in vel sub aqua baptismi, sacramentaliter videlicet ac spiritualiter non quidem in vel sub visibilibus rebus invisibiles, realiter et corporaliter occultari, sed subesse et accipi, hoc est, ideò has per illas significari, repræsentari et intelligi dicuntur, ut per eas tanquam per Spiritus Sancti instrumenta credentibus communicentur. Tamen quia seculis aliquot superioribus, istæ loquendi formæ alienum in sensum raptæ sunt, ut etiamnum a quibusdam aliter accipiantur, quàm olim usurpatæ fuerunt, non solum hæc verba ab ipsis Confessionis autoribus, statim initio in Latinis exemplaribus expuncta et repudiata sunt: et recens a Principibus eam Confessionem agnoscentibus, exemplaria illa sunt approbata, in quibus ista verba non leguntur: denique hæc et sententia et loquutio, quod Christi corpus adsit in specie panis, tanquam recens à monachis conficta et veteribus ignota in consensu Francofordiano anni 1558 diserte rejecta est, ut infra videbitur." ("Vera Sententia Augustanæ Confess.," in Works, vol. i., p. 888; Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612. See also vol. ii., pp. 1479, 1480.)

The reader can hardly fail to observe how Ursinus here (1) justifies the language of the Title retained in the Notice at the end of our First Book of Homilies, while at the same time (2) his words serve to indicate the sufficient cause why, for that Title, another was substituted in the list recognized by our Article.

And it may surely be taken as additional evidence that the cause here indicated was the true cause of the change, that we find the expression "in form of bread" finding place in the Homily of the Resurrection, as it had appeared in Taverner's Postils (see Cardwell's Edition, p. 193), but omitted in the same Homily as adopted in the Second Book of Homilies. (See Griffiths's Edition, p. 403; and Preface, p. xxxiv. See also Perry on Declaration concerning Kneeling, p. 265; to whom I am indebted for the reference to Mr. Griffiths's Edition.)

from signing the Confession of Augsburg of 1530) acknowledges* "that goodness of Christ towards His followers, whereby, no less now than at His Last Supper, to all His sincere disciples, as oft as

* Dr. Pusey, indeed, regards the language of this Confession as inconsistent. He thinks it *ought to mean* the Real Presence "honestly understood." He says it "ought to be understood of a real objective presence." (See "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 86, 87, 88.) But why should it be supposed that the language was dishonest? Why should it use words not intended to be "honestly understood"? Dr. Pusey supports his view of the Confession by saying that it "appeals to His words, 'This is my body,' as the proof that His body is *really given* in it." No doubt it does make such an appeal as proof that the body of Christ is *really given* in the Sacrament. But to argue that, therefore, the language must be the language properly belonging only to the Real Objective Presence, is surely to argue on an assumption, which not only begs the whole question, but which ought to be regarded as abundantly refuted by this Confession itself. It is an assumption which (I am persuaded) the Reformed would have repudiated. It is an assumption which lays to their charge the denial of that which they did not deny, however the opposition of error may sometimes have kept it in the background of their teaching. (See Calvin in Coverdale, "Fruitful Lessons," etc., pp. 464, 465.) Where is the evidence of their denial of that which it is here assumed that they must have denied? Where is the evidence that they did not, equally with Lutherans, believe in a *real giving?* Could there be no *giving* of the *res sacramenti*, without its being corporally under the sacramental signs? That there could not, is what the Reformed would indeed have denied. Why, then, should there be any inconsistency or dishonesty in their declaring and professing that Christ "vouchsafes to give by sacraments His own true body and His own true blood for the food and drink of their souls"? Surely those for whom the Confession was drawn up may, not unfairly, be regarded as capable judges of the agreement between these words and their own views.

Does the "Harmonia Confessionum" require any deduction to be made from the teaching of this Confession?

Does Hospinian express any dissent from the language of this Confession? Does he tell us of any one who did object to its language as saying *too much?* He *does* tell us that it fell under suspicion of teaching *too little*, of teaching "nuda, seu vacua et inania signa in Cœna Dominicâ." He *does* tell us of a Protestation which was therefore added. And in that Protestation are these words:—"Nostri concionatores *semper docuerunt*, quod Dominus discipulis suis *verum suum corpus*, et *verum suum sanguinem edendum et bibendum* DEDERIT. . . . . Neque ideo Patres senserunt, inane signum esse panem, sed quod simul cum eo DARETUR *verum corpus* Christi." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, Part ii., 1530, in Works, vol. iv., p. 166; and vol. v., p. 443. Geneva, 1681.)

Seckendorf says of the Tetrapolitan Article on the Eucharist—"Illum [Articulum] autem ita conceperunt, ut Zuinglii sententiæ diserte non adeversaretur, quapropter et illum postea probavit, non dissimulans etiam, quæ non prorsus ei placebant." (Hist. Luth., lib. ii., sect. 35, § lxxvii., p. 199.)

See also "Analecta de Reformatione Argentinensi et cumprimis de Confessionis Tetrapolitanæ apud eos usu et auctoritate diuturniori," in "Scrinium Antiquarium," of D. Gerdes, Groningæ et Bremæ, 1756, vol. v., pp. 193, sqq.; and especially p. 200, where are given the different judgments on this Confession of two Lutheran doctors. The letter of Bucer which follows (pp. 222—228) will make it quite clear how little "the Real Objective Presence" was intended to be taught by that Confession.

they repeat this Supper, He *condescends* TO GIVE, *by the sacraments, His real body and His real blood*, to be *truly eaten and drunken*, as the food and drink of their souls." (See Hall's Harmony of Confessions, p. 365; and Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 140, note; Edit. Somes, 1845. Also Hardwick's History of Reformation, p. 57; Second Edit.

(*f*) Moreover, the Helvetic Confession (1566) says, "They [the faithful] put a difference, in the administration of the Sacraments, between the Lord Himself and His minister; confessing that the substance of the Sacraments *is given* them of the Lord, and the outward sign by the ministers of the Lord. (Confitentes sacramentorum res *dari* ab ipso Domino, symbola autem a Domini

No doubt the Confession has received the impress of Bucer's mind, who desired to make it appear that the doctrine of Luther was really (as Bucer believed) on a level (or nearly on a level) with the doctrine of the Reformed.

Hence its general character may be truly said to be less guardedly cautious, and far less distinctly anti-Lutheran than some other Reformed Confessions—especially than the latter Helvetic Confession, and than our own xxxix Articles.

Its doctrinal definitions may be said rather to aim at fencing ground *common* to Lutherans and Reformed—but withal, ground which was (to say the least), quite as much, and quite as truly, Bucer's (not to say Zuingle's) as Luther's.

It is scarcely to be wondered at, therefore, that the Confession should have been regarded by some as holding something of an intermediate place between the teaching of the Lutherans and of the Swiss. (See Gerdes, Scrinium Antiquarium, vol. v., pp. 199, 209; and Augusti, Corpus Librorum Symbolicorum, pp. 639, 640; Edit. 1827.)

But as the Confession teaches nothing more than Bucer and others constantly taught, and in Bucer's sense was always (I believe) consistently and *bona fide* accepted by the Reformed; and as none will maintain that Bucer ever taught the "Real Objective Presence;" so it is, I think, impossible to maintain that the language of the Confession can be at all fairly regarded as being anything like the *property* of "*Real Objective*" doctrine.

Gerdes says—"Quid? quod, *quarto* iv. vel ideo post Conventum adhuc Smalcaldicum Argentinenses *Apologiam* suam (manifesto indicio, quam suam non tam immutassent, quod tamen fecerant Saxonici, quam potius dilucidius explicassent atque a calumnius vindicassent sententiam) auctore Bucero evulgarint, quæ in capite de S. Cœna, eandem, quam etiam in Confessione tuiti fuerant, tuetur sententiam; Sicque *primo* pernegat, 'quod in Cœna Domini nudum ac simplicem, vel communem tantum panem, qualem pistor coquit, agnoscant, sed firmiter et ex animo credere se ac docere asserit, *veram ac substantialem exhibitionem et sumptionem veri corporis et sanguinis* Christi. Simul tamen confiteri se, ad *talem* exhibitionem et perceptionem, *necessariam non esse corporalem existentiam seu præsentiam* in terrenis elementis panis et vini, *quod hoc pugnet*, cum veritate et proprietatibus inconsumptis humani corporis Christi.'" (Scrinium Antiquarium vol. v., p. 202.)

It is surely impossible in the face of this to maintain for the Tetrapolitan Confession a "*Real Objective*" sense, or to claim for the language it contains a distinctively "*Real Objective*" sound.

Gerdes adds, after concluding his extract from the "Apologia"—"Est autem hæc

Ministris." See Hall's Harmony of Confessions, p. 283, and Sylloge Confessionum, p. 76. Oxford. 1827.)*

(*g*) Thus Hospinian contends that he and the Reformed party could consistently accept the tenth Article of the Confession of Augsburg. He says, "Hæc verba, licet brevia, ambigua propter generalitatem, et obscura, nihil continent, quod nostræ sententiæ adversetur." Histor. Sacr., Pt. ii. See Goode on Eucharist, vol. ii., p. 984.)

To make the sense harmonize with the views of the Reformed, he needs no explaining away of the words which contain the reality of the giving. All he requires is, that the *Giver* be understood to be—*not the minister* giving the elements, *but Christ Himself* giving His own body and blood. He says, "Non rejiciunt igitur nostri Confessionem Augustanam . . . . nempe quod in cœna Domini una cum pane et vino, hoc est, dum sacramentum Corporis et sanguinis Domini percipiter, *vere etiam exhibeantur* ipsum Corpus et sanguis Domini fide percipienda. Dum enim *ministri* sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi distribuunt, *Christus ipse* sese impartit spiritualiter fruendum." (Ibid.)

So also Calvin declares, "Ego certe in eorum numero sum, qui Augustanam Confessionem sequi et probare volunt, cum in aliis omnibus, tum etiam in illo capite quod est de Cœna Domini." (Quoted in Goode on Eucharist, vol. ii., p. 986.)

So Peter Martyr also professed himself ready "Libenter amplecti, profiteri, ac si opus fuerit velle pro viribus tueri," the Augsburg and

eadem illa sententia, quam deinde tanquam Zwinglianam et Calvinianam denigrarunt ac damnarunt inter Lutheranos Ubiquistæ, passim per Germaniam." (Page 203.)

* It will be observed how distinctly this Confession speaks of the *giving* of the Res *Sacramenti* to the faith of the believer.

I am sorry, however, to find, that in a quotation from Hall's Harmony, which will be found above, Paper No. VI., p. 324, the words "given *to* us" are inserted in error. My quotation indeed is correctly copied from Mr. Hall's work, (p. 318). But the words are a rendering of the Latin "*pro nobis traditum.*" And I suppose they must have been a misprint for "given for us," which escaped Mr. Hall's observation.

A fair examination of the subject, however, will, I feel sure, make it evident that the difference between the Reformed theology on the one side, and that of the Romanists and Lutherans on the other, was *not* in *this* that the one denied and the other taught a *giving* and *receiving*, but that while the un-reformed taught a giving in the elements and by the priest, the Reformed believed that while the minister gave the elements to the hand or mouth of the body, Christ Himself gave the *Res Sacramenti* to faith as the hand and mouth of the soul. (See above, Paper No. VI., pp. 381—388.)

The writings of Ursinus will be found to be very full in their elucidation of this point. And nothing can be clearer than the teaching of our own Hooker. But the general harmony on the subject among Reformed theologians is very striking.

other kindred Confessions, "si recte atque Commode intelligantur." (See Hospinian Historia Sacramentaria, vol. iv., p. 421. Geneva, 1581.) See also Bucer's Justification of the Subscription to the Augsburg Confession by the four cities (1533. Ibid. p. 215.)

So also Ursinus will be found contending that the doctrine of the Reformed is in harmony with the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession (Exegesis veræ doctrinæ, cap. ix., in Works, vol. i., p. 887 sqq. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.) After quoting Art. x., he says, "Id nos corde et ore agnoscimus et fatemur," (p. 888). See also vol. ii., p. 614, 1262, 1426.

Calvin, quoting the Ratisbon edition of the Augustan Confession, says, "Verba sunt in Sacra Cœnâ cum pane et vino *vere dari* Christi *Corpus et sanguinem*. Absit vero, ut nos vel Cœnæ symbolo auferamus suam veritatem, vel pias animus tanto beneficio privemus." ("Expositio" of the *Consensus Tigurinus*. (Vol. viii., 654.)

Again, he maintains that this Confession is in harmony with the *Consensus Tigurinus*. (Ibid, p. 654.)

Hierome Zanchius also consented to sign the Augsburg Confession. (See Zurich Letters, vol. ii., p. 104.)

In like manner the "Harmonia Confessionum" will be found to express its general approval of the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession on the Lord's Supper, and in the explanation of it to require nothing to be deducted from its obvious teaching as to the *reality* of the *giving* of the *Res Sacramenti*. (See especially Obs. I., p. 127.)

Other examples, I think, would be superfluous.

(5)That the claim of such a sense for the joint expression, "datur accipitur," "given, taken," * cannot stand before the use of the same

* Ursinus declares, "Non tantum autem nos significare usu symbolorum, quid nos a Deo *accipere* credamus, sed etiam Deum significare, quid nobis *det*, probavimus hac ratione, quia Deus hæc signa nobis dat *instituendo* et per ministros exhibendo." (Anabaptisticæ sententiæ Refutatio, in Works, vol. ii., p. 1651. Edit., Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612.)

"Quo in loco [1 Cor. x.] expresse Panis nominatur tanquam signum: et communicatio corporis Christi, tanquam id quod hoc signo traditur ac percipitur. . . . Eandem loquendi consuetudinem imitatur liber Reformationis, in eo quod fatetur, duas res in cœnâ *dari et accipi*, Visibilem nempe; Panem et Vinum: et invisibilem, Corpus et Sanguinem Domini. . . . Verba Domini verba sunt traditionis et exhibitionis rerum invisibilium per visibilia signa. Ejusmodi locutiones hanc habent naturam, ut a signis quidem incipiant, sed ad id quod eum signis traditur, penitus derigantur." (Bucer, Constans Defensio Christ. Reform. Hermann. Arch. Colon., pp. 196, 197. Geneva, 1613.)

"Cum itaque ista ratio ac forma confitendi, *dari* nobis, et *accipi* a nobis in S. cœnæ mysteriis corpus et sanguinem, quæ est in libro Sacrorum proposita, sit omnino usurpata

expression in the "Consensus Orthodoxus," and other writings as cited above (Paper No. VI., p. 393) nor before the following words, "They ought to be surely persuaded with themselves, that the Lord doth *in very deed* GIVE the same thing that he doth represent, and so that we do *unfeignedly* RECEIVE *the body and blood of Christ;* yet shall they not seek it as included under the bread, or fastened, as they say, locally unto the visible sign." (Calvin, as translated by Coverdale. in "Fruitful Lessons, etc." p. 461.)

The following is from the Commentary of Wolfgang Musculus on Matt. xxvi., p. 586, sqq. (Basil, 1578.)

"Panis ac vinum non id sunt, quod principaliter *datur*. . . . Quid ergo est, quod *dedit* Christus? Id non est aliunde quam ex animo tradentis judicandum. . . . . Quid ergo dixit? Accipite, inquit, it manducate, hoc est: quid quæso Christe? hoc est corpus meum. . . . Audis expositionem doni. . . . *Donum datur*, non signum tantum declaratur. . . . . Duplex est signorum genus. Significativum unum exhibitivum alterum. . . . . Quid aliud de mensa Domini *acciperem*,

a Domino ipso (absit enim, absit, ut dicamus cum nos in sua cœna jubere tantum panem et vinum a se *accipere*, et *manducare* atque *bibere:* et non etiam ea, quæ tam claris verbis simul offert, suum corpus et sanguinem.) . . . Ego spe bona sum hanc ipsam loquendi de hoc mysterio formam et rationem omnino, ita ut est in libro explicata, iri retentum." (Bucer's *censura* in Scripta Anglicana. Basil, 1577, p. 456.)

"In dictione corpus, nullus tropus est, dominus enim suum corpus dicit, et id ipsum *offerebat*, alia licet ratione *recipiendum* et *edendum*, quam recipiantur et edantur, quæ sensibiliter et modo hujus sæculi offerentur recipienda et edenda carni." (Bucer, "Defensio adversus axioma Catholicum, id est criminationem R. P. Roberti Episcopi Abrincensis,"—No pagination.)

"Dominus Jesus . . . idipsum corpus et sanguinèm suum, sacramentis, pane et vino, discipulis *præbuit*, et jussit *accipere* ea, *edere*, et *bibere*, idque facere ad sui commemorationem, quod illi religiose quoque fecerunt." (Bucer "De vera et falsa cœnæ Dom. administratione." Neuburgi Danubii, 1546, pp. 306, 307.)

"Docendi itaque sunt homines, Christum Dominum non pani et vino, sed piis mentibus offerri per verba Domini et hæc symbola. . . . Christus Dominus *dat* se quidem fidelibus suis verè in cibum vitæ æternæ fruendum, usus ad id verbis suis, et panis vinique symbolis. . . . In hoc itaque usu *præbitionis* et *acceptionis* a Domino institutæ, panis et vinum symbola sunt corporis et sanguinis Christi, quibus scipsum nobis offert. Extra vero hunc usum, sunt quod alius panis et vinum. Nihil enim naturæ in illis mutatur: nec præbetur illis, sed fidelibus mentibus, Christus Dominus." (Bucer's Censura in Scripta Anglicana. Basil, 1557, p. 464.)

Œcolampadius also wrote "Nos hic ostendimus ita *datum*, ut *recipiatur*." (In "Epistolæ doctorum virorum, quibus cum Eucharistiæ et Anabaptismi negotium, tùm alia religionis capita . . . continentur." Fol. 54 b, 1548.)

"Veritas . . . in eo [sita est] ut . . . vere id quoque *sumendum* ipse *præbeat*." arm. Confessionum. Obs. I., p. 127.)

quam quod ipse convivator Christus convivis suis *dare* se dixit? Corpus suum dedit, non panem: sanguinem dedit non vinum." (Pages 586-7-8-9.) . . . Puto igitur manifestum esse, eos qui significationem tantum Corporis Christi et memoriam in cœna docent, in hoc deficere, quod mentem Christi non satis observant, et quod principaliter agitur, minus quam par sit, exprimunt. . . . . Potuisset et Paulus dicere, Panis, quem frangimus, memoria est Domini: verum maluit principaliter inculcare communionem Corporis et sanguinis Domini." (Ibid, p. 592.)

It is important to observe that these words are taken from an edition bearing conspicuously on its title-page the words, "Sunt autem omnia ipsius Authoris diligentia et manu recognita," and published (1578) long after Musculus had put forth (probably 1549) that "Explanation" (of what he had written on this subject in this Commentary,) which so much displeased Bucer, and which so clearly showed that the writer had completely separated himself from all fellowship with the views of those who desired even to seem to symbolize with the views of the Lutherans. In 1551 Musculus was invited by Cranmer (as he had been also 1548) to come to England, that he might occupy the post vacant by the death of Bucer. (See Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, p. 109, note.) His "Explanation" may be seen in Gorham's Reformation Gleanings, pp. 108—111. (See also pp. 103, 245, 246, 265, 494.)

It must be perfectly evident, I think, that in the view of W. Musculus, there can have been in the putting away of Lutheran or quasi-Lutheran opinions, no putting away of the reality of the *giving* and *receiving* of the *Res Sacramenti*. He must have judged that such language as speaks in the strongest way of such *giving* and *receiving* needs not and *ought not* to be *explained away*, however desirable it may be that it should be *so explained*, as to make it clear that it is to be understood as *only after a heavenly and spiritual manner*.

6. That the claim of any such Real Objective sense for the threefold expression, "given, taken, and eaten," is completely destroyed by its recurrence in Nowell's Smaller Catechism. (See above Paper, No. VI., p. 306), where, it will be observed, we find language bearing a very close resemblance indeed to that of this part of our Article;—"The body and blood of Christ, which in the Lord's Supper, are

given to the *faithful*, and are by them *taken*, *eaten*, and drunken, only in a *heavenly and spiritual manner*, but yet *in truth*."

Let me be allowed to add, that it seems to me to have been strangely left out of sight in arguing upon the Article, that these words, "*given, taken, and eaten*," are evidently intended (as it appears to me,) to refer to the Institution, and the words of Institution. Now we altogether mistake the object of our Reformers, if we imagine that in removing from our faith the Real Corporal Presence in the elements, they had any design whatever to take away anything of the fulness of the teaching of the Institution (in connexion with the teaching of John vi., especially verse 27,) and of the words of Institution.

Indeed, it may be said, I think, to have been their constant aim, to bring back the doctrine of this Sacrament, to the true teaching (as they were persuaded) of the Institution.* (For evidence of this the reader may be referred, e.g. to Cranmer "On Lord's Supper," pp. 28, 29, 30, where the words may especially be noted, "Things spoken and done by Christ, and written by the holy Evangelists and St. Paul, ought to suffice the faith of Christian people, as touching the

* "*Quo pacto fieri potest, ut fractio et manducatio panis et sumtio vini externa et corporalis, nos internæ hujus et spiritualis manducationis certiores reddat ?*

Cum Spiritus sanctus corda nostra ad firmius credendum permoveat, *ea Christi promissione*, quod omnes credentes et fractum hunc panem edentes et calicem distributum bibentes, fracto in cruce pro ipsis Christi corpore et effuso sanguine certissime pascantur et potentur.

Ubi hoc nobis promittetur ?

In cœnæ *institutione*, ubi Christus panem et vinum corpus et sanguinem suum nominat: Quæ sic at Evangelistis et Paulo Apostolo describitur: Dominus Noster," etc. (Catechesis Minor of Ursinus, in Works, vol. i., p. 40. Edit. Reuter. Heidelberg, 1612.)

"The *leading preparation* was a plain one: It was the PASCHAL SUPPER . . . Therefore, the words of the Institution do not, as M. Bossuet pretends, *carry their whole meaning within themselves;* but refer to things preceding and exterior. He trifles with us, when he challenges us to find a place in Scripture where *the sign* hath the name of the *thing signified*, given to it at the moment of the institution of the Rite, *and without any leading preparation.* We have shewn there *was a leading Preparation.*" (Warburton's Discourse on Lord's Supper; in Works, vol. x., p. 344. Edit. Hurd, 1811.) "I take in both what He *said* and *did;* and not only that, but the *mode* of saying and doing, relative to the time, the occasion, the manners, and the customs of the age; as being persuaded, that the speaker's meaning can be but very imperfectly understood without taking in all these things." (Ibid, p. 317.)

See also a very forcible passage on the *natural* (as opposed to the *literal*) sense of the words of Institution in "Cautions for the Times." (Pages 36, 37. Edit. 3d, 1868.)

doctrine of the Lord's Supper." Page 30; to Jewel, "Harding, Thess., etc.," pp. 623, 624, to Becon "Catechism, etc.," pp. 228, 229, 231, 232, 509; "Prayers, etc.," 232, 254, 256, 258, 259, 267, 269, 279—283, 358, 365; to Ridley, "Works," pp. 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17; to Hutchinson, "Works," pp. 221, 226, 227, 235, 255; to Coverdale, "Fruitful Lessons, etc.," pp. 79, 430, 431; to Bradford, "Sermons, Meditations, etc.," p. 83, 86, 489; to Hooper, "Early Writings," pp. 180, 181; "Later Writings," pp. 47, 464, 465; to Calfhill, "Answer to Martiall," pp. 231, 232, 233.) See also Ursinus, in Works, vol. i., p. 271. Oswald Myconius, in "Ad Sacerdotes Helvetiæ Suasoria," p. 14; Bullinger, "De origine Erroris," fol. 190 b, Zurich, 1539; also Bullinger in Comment. on 1 Cor. xi.)

A Lasco says, "Nos ostendemus (per Dei gratiam) veritatem ipsam verborum cœnæ, non violari doctrinâ nostrâ; sed confirmari." ("Præfatio" to "Brevis ed Dilucida de Sacramentis Ecclesiæ Christi Tractatio." London, 1552.)

In the teaching of the Reformed, the rejection of the Corporal Presence in the elements, does not (I am convinced) make the *donation* of the *res sacramenti* less real, but far more real, nor the *acceptation* less real, but far more real, nor the *eating and drinking* less real, but far more real. It is with them, as regards the doctrine they teach and the doctrine they reject, not at all a question of *giving* or *not giving*, nor of *taking* or *not taking*, nor of *eating* or *not eating*.

Neither, with them, is it at all a question of *giving*, *taking*, and *eating* of the real body of Christ or of something* else.

But the question with them, is the question of *how*—Is it *giving* to the *body* or to the *soul?* Is it *receiving* with the hand of the *body*, or with the hand of the *soul?* (See Cranmer, as quoted p. 723.)

* So Peter Martyr says, "Non enim fidei apprehensio de veritate rei quicquam derogat. Quo permulti in negotio Eucharistico hallucinantur. Quando enim asserimus, carnem Christi nos per fidem manducare, atque sanguinem potare, illico subdunt: igitur non vere isthæc habemus, quasi per fidem apprehendamus carnem Christi falsam, aut sanguinem ejus confictum." (Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 915. Basle, 1580.)

And again, "Hic est observandum, quod etsi per fidem statuimus Corpus Christi et sanguinem edi aut bibi, tamen istam sumptionem per fidem consequitur non ficta sed vera conjunctio inter nos et Christum." (Peter Martyr in Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1598. Basle, 1580.)

Is it *eating* with the mouth of the *body* primarily or with the mouth of the* *soul* alone?

This is the question with them: and it is on *this* question, that the divergence comes in between *their* teaching and the teaching of those who maintained the Real Corporal Presence. In the answer to this question it is, that they join issue, and stand apart.

They teach (as we have seen before, Paper No. VI., pp. 381—387) that the reception and manducation is all by *faith* as the soul's hand and mouth, and that the gift is given to the soul, not by the minister, but by the Saviour Himself.

And in perfect conformity with this teaching, our Article declares that the *giving, taking and receiving* (which thus remain *untouched* in their *reality*) are "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," and that "the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."

Notwithstanding all that is alleged to the contrary, the truth seems to be that what is so commonly spoken of as the Swiss doctrine of the Eucharist, is a doctrine as distinctly disclaimed by the Swiss (or, at least, by their most esteemed theologians) as by the Lutherans themselves, and as truly alien from their teaching, as from that of

* So Peter Martyr "Illi [Capernaitæ] putarunt se verum corpus et veram carnem Christi manducaturos, *quod et nos fieri concedimus.* Cæterum, discrimen est in *modo* et *ratione* manducationis: Quod illi carnaliter faciendum putarunt, nos fieri spiritualiter docemus: alioquin verum corpus, et verus sanguis exhibetur, quia fides non amplectitur ficta, sed vera." (Peter Martyr, Loci Communes, vol. i., p. 1594. Basle, 1580.)

So Cranmer, "The contention is *only* in the *manner* and form *how* we receive it." (On Lord's Supper, p. 370.)

So also Calvin, "Nos quoque veram carnis Christi κοινωνίαν de qua loquitur Paulus, non minus luculente asserimus. *Modi* tantum *definitio* quæritur." (Calvin's "Admonitio ultima ad Westphalium," in Works, vol. viii., p. 720. Amsterdam, 1667.)

Again Calvin declares that "the controversy is simply on the *mode* of eating." ("De verâ pæ participatione," etc., vol. viii., p. 743.) Ursinus declares that the controversy is "*not* whether the flesh of Christ be eaten; for this none of us deny; but *how* it is eaten." (See "True Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," as quoted in Nevin's "Mystical Presence." Page 91.)

So also the *Harmonia Confessionum* declares, "Omnes veram veri corporis, et versanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi communicationem credimus. In *modo* communicandi hæret controversia." ("Harmonia Confessionum," Præfatio; Geneva, 1581. See also A Lasco as quoted in Jenkyns's Cranmer, Preface, p. lxxx., note.)

So Œcolampadius, "Dissidium magis est de modo præsentiæ vel absentiæ: quam de ipsa præsentia vel absentia." (Quoted by Bucer, *Retractatio* in *Scripta Anglicana*, Basil, 1577, p. 644.)

any Christian Church. (See "R. Gualteri Apologia" prefixed to Zwingle's Works, Zurich, 1545, and especially, fol. e, 2, and 3.) In the early years of their Reformation, intemperate or incautious sayings may have given occasion for misunderstanding at least, if not for reproach. But there can be little doubt that subsequently that representation of their doctrine, through which we have been too much accustomed to look at it, was a misrepresentation.

Hospinian declares, "Statuuntur a nobis pro re cælesti per panem et vinum in cœna Domini significata non ipsa solum Christi merita, aut ejus ἐνεργεία, sed ipsum corpus pro nobis traditum, et ipse sanguis pro nobis effusus." (Concordia Discors, in Works, vol. v., p. 48 b.)

Again he expresses the views of the Reformed thus—"In cœna Domini non ostendi tantum nobis Christum per symbola, veluti in pictura quadam; sed sicut illa signa non tantum nobis spectanda præbentur, verum etiam in manus et os traduntur sumenda, ita quoque res per illa significatas, nobis quoque in vitam æternam *dari*, sed spirituali demum virtute per fidem participandas." (Ibid, p. 49 a. See also Œcolampadius "Ad Billib. Pyr. de Eucharistiâ Responsio," fol. c. 4, c. 5, 1526.)

Lutherans indeed, conceiving that there could be no *Real Presence*, except *in* the *Elements*, and no *giving*, *receiving*, or *eating*, without *such* a *Real Presence*, did of necessity regard the Swiss doctrine (and generally the doctrine of the Reformed) as making the Sacrament void and empty, and leaving nothing but naked signs and bare memorials. But did the Reformed ever plead guilty to this charge? Did they not always indignantly repel it? Did they not always maintain that what was thus charged upon them was not their real doctrine at all, but their adversaries' distorted view of their doctrine?

If some in our day, standing on the same standing point as the Lutherans find it impossible to conceive of any true *giving*, *receiving*, and *eating*, without a *Real Objective Presence* in the elements, it must be obvious that they may not argue thence that the language which (at the date of the Reformation) speaks of *giving*, *receiving and eating*, is necessarily *Real Objective* language, unless they can show, not only that it *seems to them* only consistent with a Real Objective sense,

but that it was acknowledged so to be by those who were opposed to the Real Objective doctrine.

If the Reformed maintained then, and we are persuaded now, that there is a most true (though spiritual) *giving, receiving, and eating* of the *res sacramenti* in the Eucharist, and that *our* view deducts nothing from (but rather adds to) its truth and reality, then our opponents have a perfect right to assail our doctrine, but they certainly have no right to claim as their exclusive possession language, which on our side we have always regarded, and which we still regard, as more truly ours than theirs.

Note E, p. 673.

I have not thought it necessary to enter into the question of subscription. Cheney certainly never signed at all. After Geste's second letter the question of his subscription seems to me of no importance. Those who are curious in the matter may be referred to Lamb's Historical Account of 39 Articles, pp. 38, 39; and Copy II., pp. 20, 21; Copy IV., at end; Bennet, pp. 183—189; Goode, on Eucharist, Supplem. pp. 7, 26, 13; Hardwick, on Articles, pp. 135, 136, Note 3; and Perry, on Declaration concerning Kneeling, pp. 77—79.

Since Geste did sign, in 1571, it must (I suppose) have been either with views changed upon further consideration and conference with other bishops, or else with some expressed protestation of exception or explanation. Bennet supposes his views changed. (Essay on Articles, p. 187. Edit. 1715.)

Change of view may be thought very unlikely in the time. But there seem to be some indications of something like variableness, or uncertainty, or inconsistency in his views. It may be observed, too, that, in shielding Cheney, he seems somewhat desirous of not being identified with him. Mr. Sedley Taylor seems to doubt whether Geste really held "the Real Presence" in the Lutheran sense. But then, I think, he had not seen (see Letter to Author of "Kiss of Peace," pp. 16—19) Geste's second letter. Mr. Sumner says, "I have not referred to the opinions of Guest . . . . for this reason. It

appears to me that quotations can be made from his writings diametrically opposed the one to the other." (In "Principles at Stake," p. 154.)

Certainly Geste's views were (at least at some periods of his life) very different indeed from those of the modern maintainers of the Real Objective Presence.

1. Neal tells us of him, that he wrote to Cecil against the ceremonies, and gave it as his opinion, "that having been evil used, and once taken away, they ought not to be used again . . . . The Gospel teaches us to put away needless ceremonies, and to worship God in spirit and in truth . . . . He declares openly against the cross, against images in churches, and against a variety of garments in the service of God . . . . for the posture [in receiving the Sacrament] that it should be rather standing than kneeling; but that this should be left to everyone's choice." (History of Puritans, vol. i., p. 130. See Dugdale's Life, Appendix IV.)

2. He was of opinion that no other garment should be used for Communion than for any other service. "For if we should use another garment herein it should seem to teach us that higher and better things be given by it than by the other service, which we must not believe." (In Dugdale's Life, p. 145.)

3. In disputation, June 24, 1549, he was with Grindal, Perne, and Pilkington, opposing Glin, who affirmed "the Corporal Presence of Christ in the Sacrament." (See Grindal's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 194, and Ridley's Works, p. 169.)

4. He was strongly opposed to the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. See his Treatise against the Privy Mass, Appendix I., in Dugdale's Life.—"I have argued (I suppose forcibly) the priest sacrifice to be neither propitiatory nor available, neither godly nor approvable, but sinful and unsufferable." (Page 103. See also Jewel, "Defence," etc., p. 1199; Zur. Letters, I., p. 11.)

5. He was strongly opposed also to adoration, or as he calls it, a "prayable Presence." "His [Christ's] body is not honourable nor prayable merely of itself, but in respect of His Godhead personally allied and coupled therewith. Christ, both God and man, with His Father and the Holy Ghost is present at the baptism of faithful infants, where they become embodied and incorporate thereto: it is, to wit, where they eat His body, and drink His blood, as really as

we do at His Supper. Howbeit no man worshippeth either His body as present at baptism, there no less presented than at His Supper, either else His Godhead, either for His own or for the presence of His said body." (See Dugdale's Life, p. 116.)

6. He objected decidedly to the consecration prayer of Edward's first book, saying, "This prayer is to be disliked for two causes, the first because it is taken to be so needful for the conservation, that the conservation is not thought to be without it . . . . The second cause why the foresaid prayer is to be refused is, for that it prayeth that the bread and wine may be Christ's body and blood, which maketh for the Popish transubstantiation." (See Dugdale's Life, pp. 147, 148.)

It will, no doubt, be observed how utterly out of harmony were Geste's views with the views of the Ritualists of our days. But it would be a mistake to suppose that there would be anything like the same discordance with the views of Lutherans of that day. The Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence was no part of a consistent system. Rather it clung, like some parasitic branch, to a system which was alien from it, or rather repugnant to it. And thus its growth may be said to have been kept ever dwarfed and fruitless.

Geste, however, never seems to have made the same open profession of adherence to Lutheran views that Cheney did. We are told of *one* bishop, (Cheney), and *one only*, declaring himself a Lutheran in Parliament.

In 1566, Jewel, writing to Bullinger, says that "some of their brethren were so eager in disputing about that matter [*i.e.*, the vestments] as if the whole business of religion was concerned in it . . . . He thanks God that they had *no other*, nor more important debates then among them. Cheyney, Bishop of Gloucester, did indeed in Parliament profess himself openly to be a Lutheran; but he was not like to have many followers." (See Burnet's Reformation, vol. iii., part i., p. 605. Edit. Oxford, 1829.)

Jewel's words are—"Unus tantùm quispiam è nostro numero, Episcopus Glocestrencis, in comitiis apertè, et fidenter dixit, probari sibi Lutheri sententiam de Eucharistiâ; sed ea seges non erit, spero, diuturna." (Vol. iii., part 2, p. 455. Records, No. lxxxiv.)

I will venture to add a suggestion, which those who are more competent than myself to consider may reject or accept. It is this, that Geste was not really a Lutheran on this point at all, but a

disciple of Bucer. The language of his second letter shews some considerable affinities to the language which Bucer used in his desire to shelter and conciliate the Lutherans. (See Hospinian, vol. iv., pp. 247a, 247, b.)

The reader may compare with the latter part of Geste's second letter the following words of Bucer, spoken concerning the Concordia Wittenbergensis:—"Dum in Ecclesia Sacramentum celebratur juxta institutionem Domini, habent integrum Sacramentum et rem Sacramenti omnes, qui sunt in Ecclesia, etiamsi ex ministris vel ex sumentibus intersint indigni et perfidi, uti Judas interfuit cœnæ primæ. . . . . Indignis porrigi etiam cum pane Corpus Domini, et sumi hoc ab eis, positum est propter verba Pauli, 1 Cor. xi., qui scribit, indignè sumentes reos fieri corporis et sanguinis Domini; et loquitur illic de iis, qui in Ecclesiâ sunt, et fidem Sacramenti habent, nec tamen Corpus Domini dijudicant, hoc est, donum hoc Christi non dignè æstimant." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, in Works, vol. iv., p. 253. Geneva, 1681.)

Bucer brought himself also to speak of oral manducation, something in the same way as Geste does, though meaning only the oral manducation of that which was *nominally* Christ's body, because of its consecrated relation to the word of donation. [So at least I understand him. See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 247a. See also Seckendorf's Historia Lutheranismi, Lib. iii., Sec. 15, § xlvii. (5) p. 130.]

On this and on other points, however, I do not mean that Bucer's language will be found to *match* that of Geste, for whose words, possibly, some allowance may be made, in consideration of the warmth of feeling under which he may be supposed to have written.

The reader may remark how Geste's letter to Cecil, accompanying the Service Book (see Dugdale's Life of Geste, pp. 142—149) manifests an animus in singular accord with the censures of Bucer. [Compare especially "Off Vestmentes," p. 145, Dugdale, with Bucer's "condemnation of those who think Christ is more received in the Sacrament of His supper than in Baptism;" also "Off praying for the deade in ye Communion," p. 146, with Bucer's censure on the Prayer for the state of Christ's Church; also "Off the prayer in the first book for conservation," p. 147, with Bucer's censure of the Prayer of Consecration; also "Off Receiving the Sacramentes in our handes," p. 148, with Bucer's censure on giving the Sacrament into

People's Mouths; also "Off receiving standinge or kneelinge," p. 149, with Bucer's censure of *Kneeling*, *Crossing*, *Smiting the Breast*, etc. See Nicholls, Additional Notes, pp. 52, 53.)

Some, perhaps, may think it very unlikely that Bucer's peculiarities should so long have outlived the breaking up of the *Concord*. But there seem to have been some who were very slow indeed to believe that Lutheran language really meant what it said, and that all hope of real agreement was at an end.*

If, then, Geste may be supposed to have been a follower of Bucer, we have no difficulty in accounting for his *penning* the "only." We have no difficulty in accounting for his desire to shelter Cheney, and to have our Articles so framed as not to be exclusive of Lutheran views. And we shall have very little difficulty in accounting for his signing the Articles, even after the letter he wrote to Cecil. For, if my conjecture is right, he did not at all himself hold the Real Objective Presence, only used language approaching that of the Lutherans with respect to the reception and eating by the unworthy, as meaning that those who knew the relation in which the consecrated elements stood by the institution of Christ to His crucified body and blood, could not receive the elements without the responsi-

* Even Bishop Davenant, writing in 1640, expresses himself as if the question of oral manducation might be (*in words*) conceded by the Reformed, evidently seeming to think that Lutheran Eucharistic statements might be regarded as effectually neutralized (if not completely evacuated) by their other doctrinal views. (See his "Ad Fraternam Communionem inter Evangelicas Ecclesias restaurandam Adhortatio," pp. 135, 136, 137; Cambridge, 1640.)

Many efforts were made about the same time to effect a union between the Reformed and the Lutherans, some account of which will be found in Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., vol. iv., pp. 158—162 (Edit. Soames); but with no other result than that of making still more evident the reality of the doctrinal difference which divided them.

Bishop Bedell also, who warmly supported Dury's designs for pacification, speaking of the Lutherans and the Reformed, says, they "differed not for ought that ever I could understand, save in the manner of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist. Yea, in that also they taught uniformly, That the body and blood of our Saviour are present, not to the Elements, but to the receiver, in the use, and without transubstantiation." (See Burnet's Life of Bedell, pp. 135, 321. London, 1685.)

The doctrine which was in the view of these Pacificators, might not unsuitably (I think) be called "The Lutheran Real Presence, un-Lutheranized by Lutheranism." But the doctrine which they had really to do with (in the case of the strict Lutherans) was "The Lutheran Real Presence fortified against Lutheranism."

And the doctrine which we have really to do with, is (I fear) "The Lutheran (or Roman) Real Presence armed for a crusade against Lutheranism and against the Reformation."

bility of the formal donation of Christ's body and blood. Those who, like Bucer, chose (as it seems to me) to express this truth (as some ancient Fathers) by saying that such unworthily received Christ's body (as receiving and eating that which they knew to be consecrated for the *conveyance*—in *giving and receiving and eating*—of Christ's body), differed *verbally only* from the Reformed [Calvin in particular strongly insists on the same thing,—see his Works, vol. viii., pp. 656, 666, 674, 692, 744, 698; vol. ix., pp. 266, 256], *really* from the Lutherans, with whom they brought themselves into some sort of *verbal agreement*, although in their desire for reconciliation they seem to have persuaded themselves that the Lutherans also did not really mean much more than themselves.

Such men, under the persuasion that Lutherans differed from the Reformed in forms of expression rather than in the doctrine of the Presence, were anxious to assimilate the language of the Reformed, as far as possible, to that used by the Lutherans, and to get the Reformed to shun all such sayings and expressions as were condemned by the Lutherans.

While not really abandoning the doctrine of the Reformed, they seemed to be, and were by some regarded, as almost Lutherans themselves. Defending and shielding and maintaining (to some extent) the language of Luther, they seemed to be defending and shielding and maintaining the real doctrine of Luther; which doctrine, however, as it was certainly not theirs, so they persuaded themselves (or brought themselves to hope, if not to believe) that neither was it truly his.

If, then, Geste were really one of these, he might possibly have written his letter to Cecil with a desire to get a shelter for Cheney, and might, perhaps, himself the very same day have not inconsistently signed the Articles, including the 29th, if only we may suppose him to have said to Parker and the other Bishops—"Mind, I only understand the Article as applying to *re vera* reception and eating. The Fathers used very different language, and I with them speak of reception by the unworthy *sacramento tenus*,"—and may suppose Parker to have said to him in reply—"Certainly: we all understand it so. It is not meant to apply to receiving and eating *sacramento tenus*." (See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 253 b.)

I make this suggestion with diffidence, aware that there is some-

what in it open to question, aware also that Bucer would hardly have written quite as Geste wrote. It does, however, seem to me to harmonize with all we know of Geste, and to make something like a way out of the difficulties which beset this matter, even if it may seem to some to lead to difficulties of its own.

At any rate it is important to observe what a very different *setting* of the "Real Objective" doctrine had in the Lutheran system and in that of the Ritualists.

The following extracts from the writings of Luther and Melancthon, will serve, I hope, to show how thoroughly the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence was kept in restraint, and made to be (comparatively at least) powerless and harmless, by its very position in the Lutheran doctrinal system; and, as regards the matter of use and application, how little, in *that* system, it had in common with the teaching of the Ritualists of our day,—"Cum ergo Sacramentum hoc voles accipere, potissima verborum erit cura, in quibus sentias eum thesaurum esse repositum, quo solo niti tuto possimus. Ad te enim sine dubio illa verba dicuntur: *Meum Corpus pro vobis traditur, Meus sanguis pro vobis effunditur.* In quem usum? num in hoc tantum, ut edas et bibas? non, imo in remissionem peccatorum tuorum. Hoc illud est, quod at te potissimum pertinet, cui omnia reliqua, quæ hic fiunt et dicuntur, serviunt, ut tibi scilicet omnia tua peccata remittantur." (Luther "Concio de Confessione, etc," A.D. 1519 in Works, tom. i., fo. 330, a. Jena, 1564.)

"Et itaque Missa, secundum substantiam suam, proprie nihil aliud, quam verba Christi prædicta, Accipite et manducata, etc. Ac si dicat: Ecce O homo peccator et damnatus, ex mera gratuitaque charitate, qua diligo te, sic volente misericordiarum Patre, his verbis promitto tibi, anto omne meritum et votum tuum, remissionem omnium peccatorum tuorum, et vitam æternam. Et ut certissimus de hac mea promissione irrevocabili sis, Corpus meum tradam, et sanguinem fundam, morte ipsa hanc promissionem confirmaturus, et utrunque tibi in signum et memoriale ejusdem promissionis, relicturus. Quod cum frequenta veris, mei memor sis, hanc meam in te charitatem et largitatem prædices et laudes, et gratias agas." (Luther "De Captivitate Babyl: Eccles." A.D. 1520. In Works, tom. ii., fo. 266. Jena, 1566.)

"Sic deinceps fere omnes promissiones aliquo signo firmavit, adeo ut hoc more Esaias juberet Achaz regem Juda, ut peteret signum a

Domino promittente liberationem populi de manu regis Syriæ et Samariæ. Apud homines quoque pacta, promissa et fœdera non solum verbis et literis, sed additis aliquibus pignoribus aut testibus firmantur. Si verbis promittunt, stipulantur manibus, si literis, appendunt sigilla, in robur fracti et promissi. Ita ut hæc promissio divina nobis omnium esset certissima, fidemque nostram tutissimam redderet, apposuit pignus et sigillum omnium fidelissimum et preciosissimum, scilicet ipsummet precium promissionis, corpus et sanguinem proprium sub pane et vino, quo nobis emeruit promissionis divitias donari, quod et impendit, ut promissionem acciperemus. Quomodo ergo sacrificium et opus nostrum facere possumus ex pignore et sigillo Dei, nobis donato et promissioni suæ appenso?" (Luther "De abroganda missa privata;" A.D. 1521. In Works, tom. ii., fo. 454a. Jena, 1566.)

"Cum autem quæritur ad quid prosit manducare, recte respondetur prodesse ad confirmandam fidem, quia est testimonium, quo admoniti statuere debemus, vere ad nos pertinere beneficia Christi. Exhibet tibi Christus Corpus suum, ut donet tibi sua beneficia, ut testetur te esse membrum, pro quo passus est, quod velit servare, in quo velit esse efficax contra Diabolum." (Melancthon, "Catechesis Puerilis" in Works, tom i., fo. 27b. Wittenberg, 1562.)

"*Quis est fructus Sumtionis?* Usitate respondetur, quod sumtio fiat ad confirmandam fidem, videlicet ut applicentur credenti beneficia Christi, sicut supra dictum est, Sacramenta esse testimonia applicationis, quod necesse est intelligi, non ut Papistæ loquuntur, ex opere operato, id est, sine bono motu utentis in adultis, sed cum fide accipiunt. . . . . Est igitur hic primus fructus, hoc testimonio confirmare fidem, et statuere, quod hoc tanquam pignore seu sigillo filius Dei se tibi applicare sua beneficia testetur, sicut et Paulus circumcisionem appellat Sigillum justitiæ." (Melancthon, "De Cœna Domini," in Works, tom. i., fol. 327b. Wittemberg, 1562.)

"Sacramenta extra usum a Christo institutum non sun Sacramenta, quia talis usus non habet verbum, et repugnat institutioni. Sicut . . . . aqua baptismi non esset Sacramentum si transferetur ad alios usus extra verbum et institutionem . . . . Ita Missa in qua fit oblatio, et applicatur aliis, non servat institutionem Christi, quæ jubet non offeri pro aliis, sed manducari et bibi, corpus et sanguinem Domini, sed transfertur ad cultum alienum a verbo." (Melancthon,

"De Missa Privata," in Works, tom. ii., fol. 193b. Wittemberg, 1552.)

"Cum ergo patres Missam seu communem cœnam Domini (ut tunc servabatur) vocant sacrificium, ex ipsorum verbis facile poterit judicari, eos loqui non de oblatione et applicatione operis, sed de gratiarum actione seu memoria sacrificii seu mortis Christi." (Ibid, fol. 197b.)

"Hæc sumtio, est testimonium, quod Christus velit tibi et singulis applicari suum beneficium . . . . Magna igitur consolatio est in hac sumtione. Scias sumtionem institutam esse, ut fides excitetur, et singuli credamus ad nos pertinere beneficium Christi." (Melancthon, "De Cœna Domini," in Works, tom. iii., p. 242. Wittemberg, 1563.)

"Hanc concionem hujus sexti capitis [Johan.], nec de ceremonia cœnæ Domini, nec de manducatione ceremoniali intelligo, sed sicut suprà Christus præfatus est, de fide, qua credimus placatam esse iram Dei morte filii, corpus suum offerentis pro nobis, et sanguinem suum fundentis." (Melancthon, "Erarratior in Evang.," tom. iii., p. 687.)

"Manducatio corporis et sanguinis Domini in nobis ipsis testimonium est, quod Christus vere nos sibi tanquam membra adjungat, quod vere velit nos abluere sanguine suo. Sic igitur utendum est Sacramentis, sicut verbo, et fides exuscitanda est et exercenda est Sacramentis, sicut verbo." (Melancthon, "In Epist. at Rom.," cap. iv., tom. iii., p. 962. Wittemberg, 1563.)

"Concionatur Christus ipse inquiens, *hoc facite in mei recordationem*. Vult enim nos ratinere memoriam passionis et promissi beneficii; nec vult tantum historiæ memoriam conservari, sed vult, ut hæc beneficia in usu Sacramenti nobis fide applicemus . . . . Semper autem de Sacramentis regula tenenda est, esse ea principaliter testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos seu gratiæ, Postea alii fines accedere possunt." ("Acta Ratisbonensia" in Melancthon's Works, tom. iv., p. 736. Wittemberg, 1564."

Appendix, Note F, p. 685.

The following passages are selected not only because, (1), they bear witness to the sense which was attributed to, and the use which was made of St. Augustine's sayings by our Reformers, but also because, (2), they will remove all doubt as to what is meant in the Article by the words "sign, or Sacrament." [See Goode on Eucharist, i., 250 sqq.; and II., 661, 664.]

"In the third [way] the *Sacrament* is eaten *without Him* [Christ]; and, therefore, it is called *Sacramental* eating only, because *only* the *Sacrament* is eaten, and not Christ Himself. . . . . The third manner of ways the wicked do eat; and, therefore, as St. Augustine saith, 'they neither eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood, although every day they eat the *Sacrament* thereof, to the condemnation of their presumption.'" (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," p. 205.)

"St. Augustine, in many places, plainly discussing this matter, saith, 'He that agreeth not with Christ, doth neither eat His body nor drink His blood, although, to the condemnation of his presumption, he receive every day the Sacrament of so high a matter.'

And, moreover, St. Augustine most plainly resolveth this matter in his book, "De civitate Dei,' disputing against two kinds of heretics. . . . . St. Augustine, answering to both these heresies, saith: 'That neither heretics, nor such as profess a true faith in their mouths, and in their living shew the contrary, have either a true faith, (which worketh by charity, and doth none evil,) or are to be counted among the members of Christ. For they cannot be both members of Christ and members of the devil. Therefore,' saith he, 'it may not be said that any of them eat the body of Christ. For when Christ saith, He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him; He sheweth what it is, (not Sacramentally, but in deed,) to eat His body and drink His blood: which is, when a man dwelleth so in Christ that Christ dwelleth in him. For Christ spake those words as if He should say, He that dwelleth not in me, and in whom I dwell not, let him not say or think that he eateth my body, or drinketh my blood.' These be the plain words of St. Augustine, that such as live ungodly, although they may seem to eat Christ's body, (because they eat the Sacrament of His body,)

yet, in deed, they neither be members of His body, nor do eat His body. Also, upon the Gospel of St. John he saith, that 'he that doth not eat His flesh, and drink His blood, hath not in him everlasting life; and he that eateth His flesh, and drinketh His blood, hath everlasting life. But it is not so in those meats which we take to sustain our bodies; for, although without them we cannot live, yet it is not necessary that whosoever receiveth them shall live; for they may die by age, sickness, or other chances. But in this meat and drink of the body and blood of our Lord it is otherwise. For both they that eat and drink them not have not everlasting life; and, contrariwise, whosoever eat and drink them have everlasting life.' Note and ponder well these words of St. Augustine: 'That the bread and wine, and other meats and drinks, which nourish the body, a man may eat, and nevertheless die; but the very body and blood of Christ no man eateth but that hath everlasting life;' so that wicked men cannot eat nor drink them, for then they must needs have by them everlasting life. And in the same place St. Augustine saith further: 'The Sacrament of the unity of Christ's body and blood is taken in the Lord's table—of some men to life, and of some men to death; but the thing itself, (whereof it is a Sacrament,) is taken of all men to life, and of no man to death.' And, moreover, he saith: 'This is to eat that meat, and drink that drink; to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him. And for that cause, he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt he eateth not spiritually His flesh nor drinketh His blood, although carnally and visibly with his teeth he bite the Sacrament of His body and blood.' . . . . By all these sentences of St. Augustine it is evident and manifest that all men, good and evil, may with their mouths visibly and sensibly eat the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood; but the very body and blood themselves be not eaten but spiritually, and that of the spiritual members of Christ, which dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in them, by whom they be refreshed and have everlasting life. And, therefore, saith St. Augustine, that 'when the other Apostles did eat bread that was the Lord, yet Judas did eat but the bread of the Lord, and not the bread that was the Lord.' So that the other Apostles with the Sacramental bread did eat also Christ Himself, whom Judas did not eat. And a great number of places more hath

St. Augustine for this purpose." (Cranmer, on Lord's Supper, pp. 210—213.

"Ridley:—'Evil men do eat the very true and natural body of Christ *sacramentally*, and no further; as St. *Augustine* saith. But good men do eat the very true body, both *sacramentally*, and spiritually by grace.'

Tresham:—'I prove the contrary by *St. Augustine*.' . . . . And a little after, 'Because some eat not unto salvation, it followeth not therefore, that it is not His body.'

Ridley:—'It *is* the body to them, *that is*, the *sacrament* of the body: and Judas took the *sacrament* of the Lord to his condemnation. *Augustine* hath distinguished these things well in another place, where he saith, The bread of the Lord, [and] the bread the Lord. Evil men eat the bread of the Lord, but not the bread the Lord; but good men eat both the bread of the Lord, and bread the Lord.'"—(Ridley's Works, pp. 246, 247.)

"Watson:—'The fathers say, that evil men do eat him which descended from heaven.'

Ridley:—'They eat Him indeed, but *sacramentally*. The fathers use many times the *sacrament* for the *matter* of the *sacrament*. . . . Evil men do eat the body of Christ *sacramentally*, but good men eat both the *sacrament* and the *matter* of the *sacrament*." (Ibid, pp. 247, 248.)

"Chedsey:—'I will prove that the evil and wicked men eat the body of Christ, as well as good men by St. Austin here.' And in the beginning of his test St. Austin seemeth to approve his assertion; but I bade him *read out* to the *end*, and there St. Austin *declareth most evidently* that it was *quodam modo*, after a certain manner, the evil man received the body of Christ, which is *sacramentally* ONLY in the OUTER SIGN, and *not* REALLY or *in* DEED, as the good do. . . .

Chedsey:—'See how he would *writhe* St. Augustine's words.'

Philpot:—'See who of us writheth St. Austin more, you, or I which take his *meaning* by his own *express words*.'" (Philpot's Examinations, p. 133.)

"*Malos non comedere carnem Christi* ipsimet Christus testatur . . . Si quis cupit hac de re plura cognoscere, *quod mali non comedant Corpus Christi*, legat. . . . Augustinum De verbis Domini, Sermone xxxiii. *tractatu in Joannem* xxvi. . . Et dicere etiam quod canes et mures, si

externum signum sacramenti acceperint, quod una cum *externo signo significatum* (hoc est, corpus et sanguinem Christi) recipiant (ut dixi), plane impium est." (Hooper's Works, ii., pp. 497-8.)

"This is the sum of the effectual talk we had; besides which talk we had a reasoning a little, whether evil men did receive Christ's body; I NO, and he YEA. I said 'they received not the Spirit, *ergo* not the body; for it is no carcass,' quoth I. *Hereto* I brought out St. Augustine how Judas received *panem Domini* and not *panem Dominum* . . . which he went about to put away with *idem*, and not *ad idem;* and how that 'in corpore Christi' was to be understood of all that be in the visible Church' . . . which I *denied* to be St. Augustine's meaning." (Bradford's Works, i., 542.)

Again, "They *eat not* Christ's body. . . . And this doth St. Austin affirm saying, 'None do eat Christ's body, which is not in the body of Christ.'" (Ibid, p. 91.)

"By what testimony of the Scripture can this be proved, that Christ's flesh is eaten unworthily, and unto damnation? Paul saith, 'He that eateth of this bread and drinketh of this cup of the Lord unworthily.' He doth not say, 'He that eateth Christ's body unworthily, or drinketh His blood unworthily,' which always be received to sanctification, to life, and salvation; but, 'He that eateth this bread;' that is, not common bread, not daily bread, but sacramental bread, that is, meant by the word 'this.' Throughout the scriptures this word 'unworthily' is never joined with Christ's body, never with His blood: for they do sanctify their receivers. *St. Austin also denieth this distinction,* . . . writing thus: 'He that abideth not in Christ, and in whom Christ abideth not, without doubt he eateth not Christ's flesh nor drinketh not His blood, although he eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing unto his damnation.' The holy father doth teach and confess here three things; which thing He teacheth likewise in many other places of his books. One is, that evil men do not eat Christ's flesh, for it is the bread of life and righteousness. Another is, that they do eat the *sacrament* and the *only figure* thereof. Thirdly, that they eat the said *only* sacrament and the *only* figure unto condemnation, making themselves, as Paul saith, 'guilty of Christ's body and blood'; which they do not receive, because they will not believe." (Hutchinson's Works, p. 264. See also p. 265.)

"I will . . . prove . . . that Christ's body cannot be eaten of the

wicked. . . . St. Augustine saith, 'Qui non manat in Christo et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio non manducat carnem Christi, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, quamvis tantæ rei mysterium ad judicium suum manducat ac bibat.' . . . In like manner writeth Prosper, 'Qui discordat a Christo, nec carnem Christi edit, nec sanguinem bibit, etsi tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium suæ præsumptionis quotidie accipiat.' And therefore St. Augustine saith: 'Mali *sacramentum* habent, *rem* autem sacramenti non habent.' Thus . . . by the old fathers it is plain, that sinful men eat not the body of Christ, receive they the *sacrament* never so oft." (Grindal's Works, pp. 58-9.)

"That the wicked, ungodly and faithless people do not eat the body of Christ, nor drink His blood.

Probations out of the old fathers. Augustine in Joan., Tract 26, 'He that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt he eateth not spiritually the flesh of Christ, nor drinketh His blood, although carnally and visibly he eat the *sacrament* of the body and blood of Christ; but he rather eateth and drinketh the sacrament of so high a thing unto his damnation.'" (Becon, Prayers, etc., pp. 462-3.)

"Notably is it said of St. Austin, 'That is a miserable servitude and bondage of the soul, to take the signs for the things signified, and not to be able to lift up the eye of the mind above the corporal creature, that it may receive the everlasting life.'" (Ibid, p. 435.)

"The wicked and unfaithful neither *eat* nor *drink* the *body and blood of* Christ, although they daily receive the *sacraments and signs* of them *as St. Augustine saith*." (Becon's Catechism, p. 292.)

"St. Augustine saith: 'They cannot be both the members of Christ and the members of an harlot. For he saith: He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him. Here doth he shew what it is, *not sacramentally* but *truly and effectually*, to eat the body of Christ, even to dwell in Him. He that dwelleth not in Christ, let him not say or think that he eateth the body of Christ, forasmuch as he is not a member of His body. He is not a member of Christ, which maketh himself a member of an harlot.' Also in another place he saith: 'This is to eat that meat, and to drink that drink, even for a man to dwell in Christ and to have Christ dwelling in him. And therefore he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt he neither

eateth spiritually His flesh, nor drinketh His blood, *although carnally and visibly he bite the sacrament of* Christ's body and blood.'" (Ibid, p. 293.)

Again, "The *ungodly* eat the *sacrament;* but they eat not Christ, which is signified by the Sacrament, as *St. Augustine* writeth of Judas." (Ibid, p. 294.)

"The Sacrament is received into our bodies, Christ's body is only received into our souls. For manifest proof of this difference, St. Augustine writeth thus:—'The *sacrament* of the body of Christ is . . . received from the Lord's table, of some unto life, of some unto condemnation. But the *thing itself*,' that is, the body of Christ, being in heaven, '*whereof* it is a *sacrament*, is received of every man unto life, and of no man to condemnation' . . . . Again he saith, 'He that abideth not in Christ, nor hath Christ abiding in him, doubtless he *eateth not His flesh*, nor *drinketh His blood*, notwithstanding he eat and drink the *sacrament of so great a thing* unto his judgment.' By these few examples it is *plain* that the sacrament of Christ's body is one thing, and Christ's body itself is another thing; and that, in *common and natural* manner of speech, neither is Christ's body the sacrament, nor the sacrament Christ's body." (Jewel, Harding, Thess., etc., p. 759.)

It is to be observed, that whereas Augustine says only "the sacrament," the Article (as if to make it impossible to mistake the meaning) says "SIGN or sacrament." (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 664.)

Hooker says—"If that be separated which is secret, and that considered alone which is seen, as of necessity it must in all those speeches that make distinction of sacraments from sacramental grace, the name of a sacrament in such speeches can imply no more than what the *outward substance* thereof doth comprehend." (Keble Edit., vol. ii., p. 260.)

It is surely needless (with these extracts before us) to add anything as to the sense of the word *sacrament* in our Article.

But it may be well to mark how there is hereby distinctness added to the previous teaching of the Article. The Article not only makes a declaration as to what the wicked do not eat, but it declares also what they *do* eat. And it declares it to be *not* the *res sacramenti*, but the *sacramentum;* and that *sacramentum* the *symbolum*.

Let the reader be asked to mark carefully how the framers of our Article have dealt with the passage from St. Augustine.

(1) They left out "Spiritualiter" which was the very word they should have been very careful to retain, if they had wished to teach the Real Objective Presence.

(2) They changed "*nec manducat*" in the body of the Article (though they retained it in the Title) into "nullo modo (in NO WAY *whatever*) participes."

And (3) that there might be no room for mistake about the word "Sacramentum" (which in its ambiguity was sometimes used to signify much more) they explained it by "*symbolum*" (which admitted only of the *limited* sense of *sacramentum*.)

It is impossible then, I submit, to question what the intention of the framers was. And if so, the question as to what St. Augustine's own doctrine was, is immaterial, though I cannot doubt that it was, in truth, the same as theirs.

The unprejudiced reader can hardly fail (I think) to observe the coherence and gradation of the teaching in Articles 28 and 29.

(1) First is answered the question—"What is the Lord's Supper?" And it is declared to be a Communion [or partaking] of the body and blood of Christ—yet with careful limitation to such as rightly, worthily, and *with faith* receive it.

(2) Secondly is answered the question as to the manner [*ratio*] of this communion or partaking, which, in reference to the words and acts of Institution, is spoken of as a giving, taking, and eating of Christ's body. And the answer is, that *it is* ONLY *after an heavenly and spiritual manner*.

(3) Thirdly is answered the question as to the instrument by which man spiritually receives that which is thus only spiritually given and received. And the answer is, that the mean of the spiritual receiving and eating is faith.

(4) Fourthly is answered the question which arises—"How, then, is it with those who have no faith such as is required for this spiritual

receiving and eating? There is given them, and they take and eat that which has been spoken of as the communion [or partaking] of Christ's body, yet they lack the instrument of spiritual receiving and eating; and it has been affirmed that there is no other way of receiving at all but spiritual,—does then the Sacrament fail to be to them a Communion [or partaking] of Christ's body, even while they eat the sign which bears the name of His body?" And the answer is—"Yes, such eat indeed (to their condemnation they eat the sign), but not Christ's body. Such partake indeed (carnally and visibly they partake of the Sacrament), but of Christ they are *no wise* partakers."

Compare the Belgic Confession:—[1] "Nequaquam erraverimus dicentes, id quod comeditur esse ipsissimum Christi corpus naturale. . . . . [2] At instrumentum, seu medium quo . . . . comedimus non est os corporeum, sed spiritus ipse noster, [3] idque per fidem. . . . . [4] Quamvis Sacramenta sint conjuncta rei ipsi significatæ: Ambæ tamen res istæ non ab omnibus recipiuntur. Malus enim recipit quidem Sacramentum in suam condemnationem, at rem, seu veritatem Sacramenti non recipit. . . . . Solis enim fidelibus Christus communicatur." (See Harmonia Confessionum, 1581, p. 126.)

So also the later Helvetic Confession (see Harmonia Confessionum, pp. 109, 110, 111), in which the same order and gradation may be very distinctly traced.

ERRATA.

In page 9, 27th line, *for* "twenty three" *read* "twenty one"
" 14, 13th " " 1855 *read* 1555.
" 27, 22nd " " coporis *read* corporis
" 32, 21st " " Work *read* Works
" 35, 30th " " Ædampadius *read* Œcolampadius
" 36, 15th & 16th line " "
" 46, 21st line, *for* A. Lasco *read* A Lasco
" 49, last " " 78 *read* 7 & 8.
" 50, last " " 221 *read* 224.
" 57, 27th " " Diallecticon *read* Diallacticon
" 69, 9th " " 1546 *read* 1550.
" 74, 14th " " Commissioner's *read* Commissioners
" 74, 30th " " copori *read* corpori
" 74, 31st " " at *read* ad
" 83, two last lines, *for* 1855 *read* 1555
" 136, 17th line, *for* φύσει *read* φύσει
" 153, first " " 1262 *read* 1562
" 201, 24th " " and mad *read* and may
" 221, 20th " " in that *read* as that
" 231, 25th " " the words *read* these words
" 247, 27th " " exhibatur *read* exhibetur.
" 259, 29th " " clamed *read* claimed.
" 263, 16th " " Tigurinus *read* Orthodoxus
" 264, 27th " " be is lesse *read* is no lesse
" 280, 24th & 31st line, *for* Tigurinus *read* Orthodoxus.
" 294, 21st & 27th line, *for* Proctor *read* Procter
" 301, 32nd line, *for* p. 404 *read* p. 408.
" 312, 33rd " " p. 360 *read* 364.
" 324, 13th " " given to *read* given for.
" 342, 19th " " neque quam *read* nequaquam
" 349, 22nd " " ai *read* ei
" 357, 23rd " " dare *read* dari
" 364, 19th " " repel *read* refell
" 366, 22nd " " p. 310 *read* p. 314.
" 385, 23rd " " fideliam *read* fidelium
" 396, 31st " " pp. 384, 385 *read* pp. 388, 389.
" 398, 9th " " acciendam *read* accipiendam
" 403, 36th " " viunt *read* erunt
" 404, 2nd " " homtnem *read* hominem
" 406, 34th " " p. 295 *read* p. 299.
" 482, 3rd " " by the minister *read* the minister
" 523, 38th " " Cantarini *read* Contarini
" 529, 42nd " " commemorative *read* commemorativo
" 693, 35th " " Questiones *read* Considerationes

The writer of these Papers anxiously desires to unite (under no party name, and for no party purposes) all who have learnt to value the true Principles of our Reformation, in a union which shall have for its primary object to "strive together in prayer," for a rekindling among us of the light of that Truth for which our Reformers died.

It seems to him that we are urgently called upon in these days to use our efforts and our influence to withstand (in the spirit of power, and of love, and of a sound mind) the agencies which are being so actively employed to bring to nought the distinctive teaching which we owe, under God, to our Reformers.

But every effort must be vain, except the Spirit of the Lord lift up a standard before us.

Why should we despair of perverts coming home, and those who are going astray being brought back to the faith of the Gospel?

Should we not rather agree together to cry mightily to our God, and give Him no rest, until He manifest His power among us in breaking the enchantment of that strong delusion, by which so many are being led out of the way?

He sends forth these Papers earnestly hoping that they may not only help to give a clearer view of the Principles of our Reformation, but a higher value for these Principles also; and that they may (by God's mercy) stimulate many to entreat God fervently to raise up His power and come among us.

May the Lord prepare our hearts, and may His ear incline thereto!

May He in mercy bless this and all other efforts, however humbly and feebly made in the cause of His Truth!

London: William Macintosh, 24, Paternoster Row.

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND BOOKS

QUOTED AND REFERRED TO.

Abridgment of Apology of Lincolnshire Ministers, 380.
Ab Ulmis, John. Letters to Bullinger, as to Religion in England, 162, 163.
Addison, Dean, quoted, 364.
Advice, The Humble, of the Westminster Assembly, 329.
Ælfric, referred to, 122.
quoted, 651, 652.
A Lasco, his influence with Cranmer, 46.
quoted, 397, 398, 587, 741.
Albertinus, 375, 678.
Aldrich, quoted, 262, 263, 408, 579.
referred to, 585.
Allen, Robert, 333.
Alley, Bishop, Poor Man's Library, quoted, 452, 543, 693.
Altar of Damascus, 380.
Ambrose, St., quoted. 98, 132, 533.
Andrewes, Bishop, quoted, 136, 581.
as to episcopacy, 304.
as to relation to Christ's Death, 417.
referred to, 527.
Antidotum Lincolniense, see Heylin.
Apology of the Church of England, account of, 198, 199.
quoted, as to limits of Christ's Body, 199, 200.
as to Sacraments, 200.
as to reception by faith, 201.
no *touching* the Body of Christ, 201, 202.

Apology of the Church of England, quoted as to adoration, 202.
as to application by faith, not by the act of the Priest, 202.
as to reception by wicked, 202, 203, 620.
as to Christ being Himself the Giver of the *res Sacramenti*, 381.
Articles, Ten, of 1536, 709.
Articles of 1538, 709.
Articles, Irish (1615), quoted for language like that of our Catechism, 327.
Articuli Visitatorii Saxoniæ, 720.
Assembly, see Westminster.
Augsburg Ministers, 403, 404.
Augustine (of Canterbury), 121.
Augustine, St., referred to, 123, 154, 676 sqq.
quoted, 29, 52, 79, 99, 100, 125, 126, 127, 128, 132, 213, 245, 383, 412, 413, 529, 564, 637, 676, 677, 730, 753 sqq.

Babington, Bishop, quoted, 543.
Bancroft, Archbishop, "Dangerous Positions," referred to, 436.
Bardsley, Rev. J., quoted, 452 sqq.
Barlow, Dr., quoted as to relation to Christ's Death, 417.
Barrow, Dr. I., quoted as to Christ's Human Nature, 140.
as to sense of word "Mysteries," 522.
as to unworthy reception, 608, 609.
Baxter, referred to, 519.
his Prayer Book quoted, 331, 436, 478, 491.
Baxter's Narrative, referred to, 478.
Bayly, Bishop, quoted, 382, 724, 726, 727.
referred to, 525.
"Beaten Oil for the Sanctuary," quoted, 507.
Becon, account of, 103.
quoted as to the words "till He come," 49.
as to altars, 61.
as to reception by wicked, 104, 106, 107, 108.
as to corporal reception, 104.
as to faith, the soul's mouth, 104, 387.
as to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 105.
as to table instead of altar, 105, 106, 108.
as to adoration, 109.

Becon, quoted, as to Elements being not bare signs, 278.
as to the *res Sacramenti* being received from God, 382.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 415.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 757, 758.
Bedell, Bishop, quoted, 748, 749.
Beleth, quoted, 633.
Bellarmine, quoted, 13, 139, 542, 553, 609, 639, 709.
referred to, 260, 632.
Bennett, Rev. W. J., "Plea for Toleration," quoted, 9.
Bennet's Essay on 39 Articles, referred to, 657.
quoted, 668.
Bernard, St., quoted, 263.
Bertramn or Ratramn, The influence of his work on Ridley, 46.
quoted, 286, 410, 414, 421, 422, 523.
Beveridge, quoted, 155, 609.
Beza, referred to as to sense of the word "Sacrifice," 31.
quoted, 120, 300, 301, 691.
as to Sacramental analogy, 340, 388, 399.
as to Sacramental conjunction, 341.
as to efficacy of Christ's flesh, 349.
as to Sacramental conveyance, 357.
as to reception of "*res sacramenti*," 389, 390.
as to sense of "with" and "under," 360.
as justifying the word "taken," 394.
as to heavenly and spiritual manner, 394.
as to real offer, 485.
as to sense of mystery, 523, 525.
as to adoration, 587.
as to unworthy reception, 659.
as to Sacramental efficacy, 695, 696.
as to reception by wicked, 709, 710.
Bilson, account of, 109.
quoted as to reception by wicked, 109, 110.
as to manducation by the soul, by faith only, 110.
as to ascending to heaven to eat, 111, 112.
as to manducation spiritual, 111.
as to dynamical presence, 111, 112, 113.
as to Real Presence, 112, 113, 307.

Bilson, quoted as to adoration, 113, 563.
as to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 113, 114, 537, 540, 548.
as to phrase "under the forms," 250, 251.
as to speech and sense of Fathers, 550.
referred to, 491, 525.
Bingham, quoted as to breaking of the bread, 491.
as to adoration, 503, 564.
as to oblations, 519.
as to sense of "mystery," 524.
as to sacrifice, 528.
Bisse, "Beauty of Holiness," quoted, 507.
Blakeney, Dr., quoted 17, 18, 191, 436, 467, 469, 524, 528, 533, 544, 545, 556, 557, 590.
referred to, 46, 162, 260, 292, 479, 519, 535.
Blunt, J. H., referred to, 162, 307, 436, 447, 466, 490, 515, 586.
Blunt, Professor J. J., quoted, 531.
Bonar, quoted, 726.
Bonaventura, quoted, 210.
Bonner, referred to, 228.
Bossuet, referred to, 529.
Bradford, account of, 78.
referred to, 158, 160, 621.
quoted as to the words, "Till He come?" 48.
as to reception by wicked, 79, 80, 81, 83, 704.
as to Presence to faith, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84.
as to Presence under the form of bread and wine, 79.
as to inclusion, 80.
as to Real Presence, 82, 83.
as to distinction between Christ's body and the grace, 83.
as to Presence on the Altar, 84.
as to Sacrifice of Mass, 84.
as to elements being not bare signs, 272, 273, 274.
as to relation to Christ's death, 416.
as to phrase "Corporal Presence," 579.
as to phrase, "give grace," 691.
as to synonymous use of "Eat" and "Receive," 701.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 755.
Bradshaw, English Puritanism, 380.

Bramhall, Archbishop, quoted, 538.
as to adoration, 563.
as to episcopacy, 304.
Brett, Dr., quoted, 458, 545, 591.
Brevint, Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass, quoted as to "full and literal" sense of words of Institution, 298.
as to Sacramental Conveyance, 409.
as to adoration, 565.
Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, quoted as to sacramental conveyance, 356, 357.
as to relation to Christ's Death, 419.
as to Organical Presence, 438.
Bridges, Dean, quoted, 38, 39.
Brooks, quoted, 336.
Browne, Bishop, On Articles, quoted, 228, 462, 497.
Bucer, referred to, 160, 162.
quoted as to giving and receiving, 393, 406, 407.
as to heavenly and spiritual manner, 394, 1.
as to first Book of Edward VI., 448, 514.
as to Prayer of Humble Access, 495.
as to Consecration Prayer, 552.
as to distinction between *receiving* and *eating*, 700.
as to points of controversy between Luther and the Reformed, 711.
as to "giving," 725.
as to "eating," 729.
as to "giving and receiving," 738.
as to "oral reception," etc., 747, 748.
Buckeridge, Bishop, quoted, 546.
Bull, Bishop, quoted as to Sacrifice, 538, 549.
Bulley, Variations, referred to, 260, 452, 466, 482, 490, 492, 493, 497, 503, 518, 519, 556, 581.
Bullinger, account of, 203—206.
Decades, account of, 206—208.
quoted, 7, 49, 99, 100, 158, 159, 160.
as to Sacramental Union, 209.
as to reception by wicked, 209.
as to limits of Christ's Body, 209.

Bullinger, Decades, quoted, as to relation of grace to Sacraments, 210.
as to sense of words, "This is My Body," 212.
as to presence "unspeakably," "not as in a place," 213.
as to words, "until He come," 214.
as to ubiquity, 214.
as to vestments, 631.
as to Real Presence, 214.
as to spiritual eating, 215.
as to reception by unbelievers, 216.
referred to as to Priest and Sacrifice, 217.
as to elements being not bare signs, 279, 280.
as to effectual signs, 604.
as to sense of "spiritually," 723.
as to "giving," 725.
as to reception of "Res Sacramenti," 726.
as to "eating," 728.
Burcher, Letter to Bullinger referred to, 160.
Burgess, Dr., referred to, 311, 312.
quoted, 574.
Burgess, "Reformed Church of England," 522.
Burnett, referred to, 183, 466, 467, 673.
quoted, 567, 574.

Calfhill, account of, 114,
as to Mass and Sacrifice, 114, 115.
Calovius, Exegema Aæ., Confess., 710.
Calvin, quoted, 35, 36, 247, 258, 280, 339, 342, 348, 353, 381, 382, 384, 604, 679, 691, 718, 719, 727, 736, 732, 726, 743.
as to manducation, 395, 396.
as to word *substance*, 402, 403, 405.
as to real offer, 486.
as to adoration, 587.
as to sacramental efficacy, 696, 697.
as to "giving," 726.
referred to, 371.
Campion, the Jesuit, quoted, 625, 701.
Canon 57, quoted, 462.

Canons of 1640, quoted, 526.
Cardwell, Doc. Annals, quoted, 60, 311.
Reformatio Legum, referred to, 177, 178.
Synodalia, referred to, 183.
quoted, 233, 527, 581.
Conferences, referred to, 292, 293, 308, 313, 363, 447, 466, 478, 490, 495, 519, 556, 583, 673.
Liturgies of Edward VI., Preface quoted as to the influence of foreigners, 497.
as to first Liturgy, 505.
referred to, 515.
Carter, Rev. T. T., quoted, 591.
Cartwright, T., quoted, 29, 30.
Cary, Testimonies of Fathers, quoted, 679.
Case of Kneeling, quoted, 572.
Cassander, referred to, 539, 539, 551, 553.
Catalini, quoted, 503.
Catechism, of Edward VI , account of, 182, 183.
quoted as to Christ's absence in Body, 184.
absent from mouth, but present to faith, 185.
as to reception by the working of the Spirit, 186.
as to faith the soul's mouth, 187, 386.
Catechism of Cranmer, quoted, 287, 288.
referred to, 506, 507.
Catechism of Nowell, account of, 187—191.
quoted as to limits and absence of Christ's Body, 192, 193, 197, 198.
as to the sealing efficacy of Sacraments, 193.
as to reception by faith only, 194.
as to comparison with Baptism, 195.
as to faith the soul's mouth, 195, 386.
as to secret and marvellous communication, 196.
as to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 197.
as to relation to Christ's death, 197.
as to reception by faithful only, 197.
as to sense of *faithful*, 365.
as to *res sacramenti* being given by the Holy Ghost, 385.
as to relation to Christ's *Death*, 416.

Catechism, Nowell's Smaller, quoted, 306, 395, 723, 724, 739, 740.
Catechism, The Church, Its elementary character, 290—295.
addition to, desired at Hampton Court Conference, 308.
at Savoy Conference, 291.
part added at Hampton Court Conference, 292.
its authority, at first, only that of the King's Proclamation, 293.
drawn up by Bishop Overall, 295.
compiled from Nowell's smallest Catechism, 306.
its teaching supported by language of our Reformers, 320—322.
of Foreign Confessions, 323—328.
of English Puritans, 229—333.
Catechism, an old English (Froschover), quoted, 728.
Catechism, Heidelberg, quoted, 401, 402.
Catechism of Calvin, quoted, 405.
Cautions for the times, quoted, 591, 740.
Cazenove, "Aspects of the Reformation," quoted, 175.
Chamier, Panstratia Catholica, referred to, 491, 523, 692.
quoted, 697, 714.
Charnock, quoted for language like that of Catechism, 332, 333.
Cheke, Sir John, quoted, 56.
Christian Observer, referred to, 695.
Christian Remembrancer, referred to, 467.
Chrysostom, quoted, 52, 131, 132.
Church and the World, 473, 502, 514, 515, 516, 519, 521, 522, 588.
Church and the Age, 508, 520, 535, 542.
Churton, Archdeacon, quoted, 263.
"Coal from Altar," 481.
Cobb, Rev. G. F., "Kiss of Peace," referred to, 11, 291, 394, 490.
quoted, 13, 18, 294, 340, 362, 392, 433, 616.
Colet, Dean, his Catechism, quoted, 307.
Collier, Eccles. History, quoted, 56, 249, 308, 309, 310, 312, 639.
referred to, 183, 466, 499, 514, 515, 526.
Colloquy of Poisy, quoted, 328.
Comber, Dean, quoted, 606.
Comparison between Liturgy and Mass-book, 380.
Concordia Witebergensis, 715.
Confessions of Faith, 167.
2nd Helvetic, quoted for language like that of our Catechism, 324.

Confessions, 2nd Helvetic, quoted as to Sacramental efficacy, 696.
as to giving, 735.
1st Helvetic, quoted for same purpose, 324, 325.
quoted, 723.
referred to, 717.
of Basle, quoted for same purpose, 325.
of France, quoted for same purpose, 325, 326.
of Scotland, quoted for same purpose, 326.
of Belgia, quoted for same purpose, 327.
quoted, 760.
of Augsburg, quoted, 367.
Tetrapolitan, quoted, 733, 734.
Westminster, quoted as to breaking of bread, 491.
as to phrases "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," 583.
Consensus Orthodoxus, quoted, 280, 680, 719.
as to real reception of the "Res Sacramenti," 342.
as to exhibition by Holy Spirit, 385.
as to "Datur et accipitur," 393.
as to manducation, 396.
as to phrases, "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," 583.
as to reception by unworthy, 657, 658, 659.
as to phrase, "Confer grace," 694, 695.
Consensus Tigurinus, quoted, 406.
Contarini, G., quoted, 523, 540.
Cooke, Sir Anthony, 72, see Diallacticon.
Cooke, Letter to Perry, referred to, 519.
Cooper, account of, 115.
quoted as to meaning of "This is my Body," 116.
as to sacrifice, 116.
Cosin, Bishop, referred to, 13, 328, 482, 502, 508.
quoted, 263, 308, 412, 493, 496, 552.
as to Mass, 526, 539.
as to oblation, 529, 540, 548, 549, 550.
as to adoration, 571.
as to elevation, 571.
his change of views, 297.
as to eating of Christ's flesh as *Crucified*, 360.
as to consent of Protestants in Real Presence, 371.

Cosin, Bishop, quoted as to kneeling at Communion time, 575.
Couper, see Cooper.
Courayer, quoted, 529, 534.
referred to, 560.
Coverdale, account of, 117.
quoted as to manducation by faith, 117.
as to Mass and Sacrifice, 117.
as to adoration, 118.
as to expression "under the forms," 248.
translation of Calvin quoted, 381.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 414.
Cox, referred to, 167, 649, 692.
Crackanthorp, Defensio Eccles. Angl., quoted, 472, 473.
as to Rainolds, 311.
as to adoration, 472, 473.
referred to, 564.
Cranmer, account of, 14,
quoted as to Corporal Presence, 15, 16, 371.
as to "true eating and drinking," 15.
as to Spiritual Presence, 16.
as to reception by wicked, 704.
as to offering Christ, 16.
as to oral manducation, 17.
as to gross carnal eating, 17, 18.
as to "Real Presence," 21.
as to *not real* sense of *Sacramental*, 98, 99.
as to guilt of unworthy receivers, 159.
as to "being under the form of bread and wine," 231, 288.
as to elements being not bare signs, 270.
as to giving of the *res sacramenti*, 320, 321.
as to spiritual eyes, hands, mouth, 338.
as to substantial Presence, 342.
as to digesting Christ's Death, 354.
as to digesting Christ's Flesh *absent*, 355.
as to Christ being Himself the giver of the *res sacramenti*, 381.
as to faith being as hand and mouth, 385.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 413.
as to relation to Christ's Death, 416.

Cranmer, quoted as to eating "that selfsame body," 423, 424.
as to Presence in elements, 485.
as to his independence of foreign aid, 500.
as to 1st Book of Edward, 506, 518.
as to adoration, 575.
as to phrase "Real Presence," 578.
as to unworthy reception.
as to distinction between *real* and effectual receiving, 611, 612.
as to synonymous use of "*eat*" and "*receive*," 701.
as to sense of spiritually, 723.
as to "receiving," 730.
as to "giving," 732.
as to "Institution," 740, 741.
as to mode of reception only in question, 742.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 753, 754.
influenced by Ridley, 45.
by A. Lasco, 46.
sent First Book of Homilies to Gardiner, 227.
quoted also, 437, 442, 470, 593, 594.
referred to, 148, 182.
see Catechism.
Cudworth, Discourse concerning Lord's Supper, referred to, 527.
Cyprian, quoted, 247.
referred to, 530, 530.
Cyril, quoted, 123.
Cyril, Lucar, 695.

Daniel, Dr., Codex Liturgicus, quoted, 543, 650.
D'Aubigne, quoted, 583.
Davenant, Bishop, quoted, 728.
referred to, 748.
Davenport, Letter to Sanderoft, concerning Overall and Mason, 303.
Debate concerning the English Liturgy, 378.
Declaratio Thoruniensis, quoted, 494, 495, 582, 599, 600.
Declaration of twenty-one Priests, 527.
Defence of a certain poor man, quoted, 248.
Denison, quoted, 7, 601.
referred to, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 436.

Diallacticon, the authorship, 72.
quoted, as to dynamical presence, 72, 73, 74.
illustrated by Sun, 73.
as to limits of Christ's Body, 73.
as to symbolical Body, 73.
Directions, propounded and humbly presented to Parliament, 377.
Directorium Anglicanum, 455.
Directory, see Westminster.
Doctrine of the Eucharist stated, quoted, 560.
Dorman, 646.
Downes, Appendix to Sparrow's Rationale, quoted, 498, 499, 557.
referred to, 499.
Dryander, referred to, 228.
Dublin, see Review.
Dugdale, Life of Geste, 466, 745.
Du Pin, quoted, 535.
referred to, 544.
Durandus, quoted, 415, 553.

Edgar's Variations of Popery, referred to, 326, 328.
Edward, King, see Catechism.
Letter to Ridley, quoted, 60, 452.
Elizabeth, Queen, Injunctions, 60.
Elliott, Rev. E. B., quoted as to Sarum and York Manuals, 411.
Emissenus, quoted, 283, 386.
Enchiridion, Christ. instit. of Hermann, quoted, 530.
Essays on the Church, referred to, 322.
Estcourt, Dogmatic teaching of the Common Prayer, referred to, 162.
quoted, 461, 463, 493.
Examination—Short, Sober, Pacific, of Common Prayer, 378.
Exceptions, LIX., against Book of Common Prayer, 378.
Exercise, see Morning.

Faber, Difficulties of Romanism, referred to, 544.
Fagius, P., referred to, 160, 514.
Felix, Minucius, quoted, 564.
Field, Bishop, Parasceve Paschæ, quoted, as to real offer, 486.
as to teaching of Catechism, 487.
as to Prayer of Humble Access, 495.
referred to, 518.

Field, Dean, quoted, 268.
Fisher, Ambrose, "Defence of Liturgy," referred to, 312.
quoted, as to meaning of Catechism, 364.
as to adoration, 574.
as to phrase "confer grace," 694.
Flavel, quoted, for language like that of our Catechism, 330.
Forbes, Bishop (Edinburgh), "Considerationes Modestæ," referred to, 692.
Forbes, Bishop, on Articles, quoted, 395, 396, 617.
referred to, 8, 392, 393, 433, 542, 567, 679.
Formula Concordiæ, quoted, 670, 672, 715, 720, 721, 722, 729.
Fortescue, Letter to Archdeacon Freeman, referred to, 479.
Foxe, John, quoted, 60, 579.
Acts and Monuments, account of, 233.
quoted, 239.
referred to, 627.
Frankfort, Ministers of, quoted, 405.
Freeman, Archdeacon, quoted, 462, 565, 566.
referred to, 473.
Fulgentius, referred to, 154, 681.
Fulke, account of, 118.
as to words "Sacerdos," "Priest," etc., 118.
as to Mass and Sacrifice, 119.
as to sacramental signs and pledges (Beza), 120.
as to Corporal and Spiritual Presence, 120.
as to Sacrifice, 121, 122.
as to Carnal Presence, 121.
as to adoration, 121.
as to reception by wicked, 122.
as to praying towards the East, 481.
as to reception by the wicked, 625.
as to sense of St. Augustine, 625.
as to "effectual signs," 692, 693.
as to synonymous use of "eat," and "receive," 701.
Fuller, Church History, quoted, 311.
referred to, 327.

Garbett, Voices of the Church of England, referred to, 7, 583.
quoted, as to teaching of Laudian School, 373, 374.

Garbett, Lecture on the Lord's Supper, quoted, 81, 82, 526.
Gardiner's Examination of Roman Catholic Faith, referred to, 678.
Gardiner, Bishop, quoted, 13, 231, 470, 610, 663, 701.
Gauden, Eccles. Angl. Suspiria, referred to, 510.
Gerdes, Scrinium Antiquarium, quoted, 734, 735.
Gerhard, Confessio Catholica, quoted, 529, 530.
as to adoration, 566.
Geste, Bishop, referred to, 466.
quoted, 702, 745, 746.
as to Consecration Prayer, 552.
as to the word "only" in Article 28, 665.
as to Article 29, 666.
Goade, in Conference with Campion, 625.
Goode, Dean, referred to, 13, 101, 228, 266, 268, 296, 318, 459, 477, 519, 544.
quoted, 198, 199, 224, 225, 231, 269, 300, 458, 468, 469, 601, 633, 675, 676, 677, 684, 721.
as to language of Catechism, 337, 343.
as to Real Presence, 374.
as to figurative sense of *eating*, 421.
as to *change* by consecration, 553, 554.
as to ancient Liturgies, 560.
as to phrase, "Real Presence," 585.
Goodwin, quoted, for language like that of our Catechism, 333.
Gorham, Reformation Gleanings, referred to, 456, 570, 648, 714.
Goulburn, quoted, 420.
referred to, 491, 525, 541.
Grabe, quoted, 457.
referred to, 518.
Gregory, St., quoted, 246, 552, 553.
Gregory XI., Pope, quoted, 7.
Grindal, Archbishop, account of, 24.
quoted, as to reception by wicked, 24.
as to oral manducation, 24.
as to reception by faith, 25.
as to Christ's body, 26.
as to Sacrament and Sacrifice, 26.
as to change of Views due to Bullinger, 26, 27.

Grindal, Archbishop, quoted, as to Spiritual mode of Presence and Reception in Eucharist—not left an open question in the English Church, 27, 28.
as to Baptism by Women, 26.
as to Guilt of unworthy Receiving, 159.
as to Elizabeth's restoration of Edward's Reformation, 166.
as to agreement with Helvetic Confession, 167.
as to faith as mouth, 387.
as to Luthero-Papistical Ministry, 634.
as to word "taken," 732.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 756.
Gropper, referred to, 529.
Grueber, referred to, 101, 365, 433, 698.
Gualter writes (in conjunction with Bullinger) concerning false report of the doctrine and practice of the English Church, 27.
referred to, 167, 696.

Haddon, quoted, 580.
Hall, Fragmenta Liturgica, referred to, 436.
Hall, Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, referred to, 436, 478, 496.
Hall, Harmony of Protestant Confessions, referred to, 319.
quoted, for language, like the language of Catechism, 323—327.
Hall, Bishop, referred to, 312, 377, 460, 496.
quoted, as to reality of Spiritual reception, 339.
as to relation to Christ's Death, 418.
as to reception by faith only, 427.
as to teaching of Prayer Book, 479, 487, 488, 510.
as to words of delivery, 494.
as to elevation, 503.
as to sacrifice, 532, 551, 558.
as to adoration, 574.
Hallam, quoted, as to doctrine of Overall's Convocation Book, 304.
as to Rainolds, 310.
as to Queen Elizabeth, 568.
referred to, 309, 444, 634.
Hammond, quoted, as to simplicity of Catechism, 292.
as to God being the Giver of the *res Sacramenti*, 383.
as to organical Presence, 427.

Hammond, quoted, as to relation of Prayer Book to Missal, etc., 508, 512.
as to phrases, "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," 581.
Harding, referred to, 245.
quoted, 245, 257.
Hardwick, on Articles, referred to, 23, 163, 165, 229.
History of Reformation, referred to, 228, 692, 715.
quoted, 721.
as to Bishop Overall, 303.
as to revision of Prayer Book in Edward's VI.'s reign, 513.
Harmonia Confessionum, quoted, 388, 405.
Harmony between Old and Present Nonconformists, 380.
Harris, Claims of Priesthood, 544.
Harrison, Archdeacon, on Rubrics, referred to, 518.
Harrison, "Whose are the Fathers?" referred to, 304.
Harrison, Joseph, as to the sense of the words of Catechism, 358.
Heidelberg, see Catechism.
Henry IV., King, quoted, 19.
Herbert, G., referred to, 571.
Heurtley, Dr., quoted, 460, 469, 562, 665, 666.
referred to, 496, 518, 588, 709.
Hey, Professor, referred to, Lectures, 522.
Heylyn, Antidotum Lincolniense, quoted, 481, 482, 582.
History of Reformation, referred to, 515, 567, 568.
quoted, 634.
Hickes, Dr. George, Treatises, quoted, 538.
referred to, 454, 219, 529, 531, 544.
Hierome, see Jerome.
Hilles, quoted, 447.
Holy Table—Name and Thing, quoted as to Adoration, 575.
Homilies—Their authority, 223.
The phrase in the Notice "Under the form of bread and wine," 224 sqq.
One of them written by Bonner, 228.
quoted, as to Lord's Supper being no bare sign, 267.
as to being "guests and not gazers," 281.
as to "memory" not "sacrifice," 282, 285.
as to "making Christ thine own," 283.
as to no need of "Sacrificing Priest," 283.

Homilies, quoted, as to gross carnal feeding, 283.
as to "faithless cannot feed," 284.
as to receiving "not the shadow only, but the Body," 284.
as to knowledge required for Lord's Supper, 291.
quotation from Emissenus, 320.
as to reality of reception and possession of the Res Sacramenti, 345.
as to appropriating faith, 352.
as to illustration of Prayer of Humble Access, 496.
as to vestments, etc., 633.
Hook, Dean, referred to, 162, 175, 183, 228, 260, 443, 444, 514, 525.
Hooker, account of, 136.
quoted, 18, 20, 35.
as to Christ's human nature and ubiquity, 137.
as to mixture of substance of Christ's flesh with ours, 137, 141.
as to the necessity of the Presence of Christ's body being definite and local, 138, 139.
as to absence of Christ's Body from Earth, 140.
as to its Presence "after a sort," 140.
as to the infinite merit and possibility of application of Christ's sacrificed body, 141.
as to Presence in elements, 141.
as to Consubstantiation and Transubstantiation, 141.
as to corporal and oral manducation, 142.
as to grace received from God and not from Sacraments, 143, 144.
as to Sacramental Efficacy not contained, 143, 144, 693.
as to Real Presence in Receiver, 143.
as to Presbyters and Priests, 144, 146.
as to Sacrifice, 144, 145.
as to Mingle-Mangle of religion and superstition, 146.
as to elements being not bare signs, 276, 277, 690, 691.
as to Jewel, 322.
as to acknowledgment that the *Efficacy* is not all that is received, 342.
as to quickening power of Christ's flesh, 349.
as to the *res sacramenti* being received from a Divine Person, 381, 382, 383.

Hooker, quoted, as to relation of Christ's Death, 416.
as to Sacramental relation, 485.
as to adoration, 573.
as to Corporal Presence, 580.
as to sense of word "Sacrament," 758.
Hooper, Bishop, account of, 85.
quoted as to the words "till He come," 48.
as to Presence in, under, with, the elements, 85, 88.
as to receiving verily and indeed the *res sacramenti*, 86.
as to spiritual reception by faith, 86.
as to reception by wicked, 86.
as to reception spiritually, 88.
as to dynamical Presence, 88.
as to the change by Consecration, 89.
as to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 89.
as to Sacramental Efficacy for body and soul, 91.
as to presence and absence, 90.
as to reception by wicked, 90, 91.
as to doctrine of Luther, more erroneous to Papists, 91.
as to guilt of unworthy reception, 159.
as to elements being not bare signs, 274.
uses language like that of the Catechism, 321, 322.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 414.
quoted also, 384, 397, 580.
as to phrase "give grace," 691.
as to *opus operatum*, 693.
as to sense of "spiritually," 723.
as to word "taken," 731.
as to word "given," 732.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 755.
referred to, 160, 163.
Hooper, Bishop George, quoted, 602.
as to Adoration, 577.
as to the Protestantism of the Church of England, 622.
Horne, Bishop, writes (in conjunction with Grindal) to Bullinger concerning the doctrine and practice of the English Church, 27, 28, 634.

Horne, Bishop, writes to Bullinger as to English having the same doctrine as Zurich, 167.
Horneck, "Crucified Jesus," 695, 713.
Horsley, Bishop, referred to, 521.
quoted, 724.
Hospinian, referred to, 346.
quoted as to consent between Calvin and Zwingle, 398—400.
quoted also, 403, 404, 405, 406, 412, 525, 659, 682, 712, 713, 716, 723, 724, 734, 736, 743, 747.
as to Queen Elizabeth, 569.
referred to, 492, 678.
Humphrey, referred to, 463, 519, 527.
quoted, 477, 493.
Husband, Rev. E., "Catholic Tracts," quoted, 10, 434, 488, 489.
Hutchinson, account of, 92.
quoted as to reception, not in the bread, 92.
as to reception by wicked, 92, 93, 94.
as to spiritual reception by faith and no other reception, 93.
as to Sacrifice and Mass, 94, 95.
as to Sacerdotium and Priest, 95.
as to elevation and adoration, 96.
as to guilt of not receiving, 159.
as to receipt by faith only, 335.
as to receipt from God, not from bread, 382.
as to Sacramental conveyance, 410.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 414.
as to unworthy reception, 608.
as to sense of "spiritually," 723.
Hutton, Answers to Exceptions to Prayer Book, quoted, 313, 314, 366, 571.
Hymnal, People's, quoted, 561.

Jackson, Dean, quoted, 607.
as to Christ's Human Nature, 349, 360, 382.
as to faith being a mouth, 387.
as to dynamical Presence, 425.

Jacobson, Bishop, quoted, 187, 307, 309.
James I., King, quoted, as to directions for framing addition to Catechism, 363.
Jenkyns, Rev. H., Preface to Cranmer's Works, quoted, 509, 510, 516, 715.
Jerome, St., quoted, 98.
Jewel, account of, 122. (See Apology.)
quoted, as to Christ's Body being in the vessels, 52, 53.
as to sense of Sacraments, 98.
as to presence of Christ's Body in heaven only, 123, 124.
as to manducation by faith only, 123, 124, 126, 128, 129.
as to Presence "really," "corporally," "carnally," 123, 132.
as to the use of the word "figure," 123.
as to organical Presence, 124.
illustrated by Sun, 124.
as to Sacraments covertly containing, 125.
as to Union with Christ, 125.
as to "the grace" being called "Christ's Body," 125, 126.
as to spiritual and oral Reception, 126.
as to reception by wicked, 127, 128, 129.
as to eating "indeed and verily," but spiritually, 128, 335, 336.
as to holding by faith, 129.
as to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 130.
as to adoration, 130, 132, 134, 135.
as to Christ's presence in the stall and on the altar, 131, 132, 133.
as to guilt of NOT receiving, 158, 159.
as to Ubiquitarian doctrine refused in England, 166.
as to completeness of Reformation, 166.
as to phrase "under the form," 245 sqq.
as to phrase "by bread and wine," 257.
as to elements being not bare signs, 274, 275, 276, 322.
as to difference between *verily* and *fleshly*, 334.
as to representative Sacrifice, 372.
as to faith being as hand and mouth, 386.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 414.
as to "very Body," 422.

Jewel, quoted, as to *grace* called *Body*, 425.
as to meaning of "mysteries," 522.
as to phrase "Real Presence," 578.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 684, 685, 758.
as to *opus operatum*, 692.
as to sense of "spiritually," 723.
as to the word "taken," 730.
as to word "given," 732.
as to Cheney's Lutheranism, 746.
Ignatius, St., quoted, 98.
referred to, 530.
Innocent, Pope, quoted, 7.
Innocent IV., quoted, 535.
Johnson, J., referred to, 554.
quoted, as to adoration, 576.
Jolly, Bishop, Christian Sacrifice, referred to, 515.
Jonas, Justus, see Catechism, 287.
Judgment, Final, in the case of Liddell *v* Weston, 452.

Keble, on Eucharistic Adoration, referred to, 286, 297, 362.
Ken, referred to, 155.
Kennet, quoted, 303.
Kettlewell, quoted, as to adoration, 573.
Kimmel, "Monumenta fidei Ecclesiæ Orientalis," 695, 709.
Kiss of Peace, see Cobb.
Knollys, Sir Francis, 649.
Knox, A., Remains, quotation from Bishop Overall referred to, 297, 299.
Kœcher, Bibliotheca Theol. Symb. et Catech., 695.

Lake, Bishop, quoted as to Sacraments being an annexe to doctrine, 357.
as to eating Christ's flesh as *broken*, 360.
as to a Divine Person being the giver of the *res sacramenti*, 383, 385.
as to faith being as mouth, 387.
as to relation to Christ's Death, 418.
as to "effectual signs," 694.

Lamb, Historical account of Articles, referred to, 183.
quoted, 635, 668, 669, 672, 684.
Laski, see A. Lasco.
Lathbury, History of Convocation, referred to, 292.
History of Non-Jurors, referred to, 695.
History of Common Prayer, referred to, 481.
Latimer influenced by Cranmer, 45, 65.
account of, 63.
quoted as to spiritual presence, 64.
as to Mass, 65, 67, 68.
as to spiritual eating, 65, 66, 67.
as to the giving of Christ's Body to the mind, 66.
as to effects of Consecration, 67, 67.
as to sacrificing and preaching, 68, 69.
as to elements being not bare signs, 271, 272.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 414.
as to phrases, "Real Presence," "Spiritual Presence," 579.
as to synonymous use of "eat" and "receive," 701.
L'Aroque, History of Eucharist, referred to, 422, 492, 503, 523, 632.
quoted as to Adoration, 565.
Laud, Archbishop, referred to, 482, 518.
his views, 304, 371, 375.
quoted as to phrase "Corporal Presence," 581.
Conference with Fisher, quoted, 371, 372.
Laurence, Archbishop, referred to, 447, 499.
Le Bas, Life of Cranmer, quoted, 500.
Lee, Dr. F. G., quoted, 534.
Leibnitz, System of Theology, quoted, 470.
Leighton, Archbishop, quoted as to reception of *res sacramenti*, 394.
L'Estrange, "Alliance of Divine Offices," quoted, 310.
as to meaning of North side, 480.
as to 2nd Book of Edward, 505.
as to Black Rubric, 571.
as to phrase, "Real Presence," 581.
Letters, Original (Parker Soc.), quoted, 514, 515.
Ley, John, "Debate concerning English Liturgy," 378.
Life of the 70th Archbishop of Canterbury, 654.
Lingard, History of England, quoted, 568.

Littledale, Dr., referred to, 175.
quoted, 8, 9.
Little Prayer Book, 561.
Liturgy, the English, Puritan works against, 376, 384.
difference between 1st and 2nd of Edward, 44, 80, 99.
Liturgies of Edward VI. (Parker Soc.), referred to, 518.
Llandaff, Bishop of, see Ollivant.
Locke, on Understanding, quoted, 139.
Lombard, quoted, 210.
Longley, Archbishop, quoted, 32, 73, 74, 156, 455, 592.
Luther, referred to, 164.
quoted, 154, 346, 412, 535, 694, 750, 751.

Machyn's Diary, referred to, 649.
Mackonochie, quoted, 6, 8, 101, 392, 470.
Magdeburg centuries, 654.
Malan, Rev. S., referred to, 363, 530, 632.
quoted as to relation to Christ's Death, 420.
as to Priesthood, 543.
as to phrase, "Real Presence," 585.
Mann, Bishop, Exposition of Catechism, referred to, 318.
Mant, Bishop, referred to, 519.
Manual, Sarum and York, 411.
Marriott, Rev. W. B., quoted, 528.
Martin, Archdeacon, quoted, 58, 139.
referred to, 302.
Martyr, Peter, referred to, 160, 162, 519.
quoted, 31, 33, 629, 696, 710, 722, 727, 729, 730, 736, 741, 742.
as to the English Reformation in 1555, 689, 690.
as to Concordia Witebergensis, 718.
Maskell, Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, quoted, 462, 560, 561.
referred to, 491, 553.
Mason, F., on Foreign Ordinations, referred to, 303.
Vindiciæ Eccles. Anglicanæ, quoted, 304, 305, 501, 535, 536.
Mayer, on Church Catechism, referred to, 318.
quoted, 387.
Medd, Rev. P. G., quoted, 321, 473, 555, 590.

Medd, Rev. P. G., referred to, 482, 496, 515, 517.
Mede, quoted as to Oblations, 519.
as to Sacrifice, 528, 530.
Melancthon, referred to, 163, 164, 580.
quoted, as to Sacramental efficacy, 694, 695.
as to Lutheran doctrine, 751, 752.
Micronius, M., quoted, 405.
Middleburgh Prayer Book, 435, 436, 491, 523.
Migne, Patrolog., 503, 587.
Missal, see Sarum.
Montague, Dr., referred to, 311.
More, Sir Thomas, his "Dialogue," referred to, 42.
Morley, quoted, as to "Corporal Presence," 583.
Morlinus, 718.
Morning Exercise against Popery, 529, 540.
Morton, Bishop, quoted, 49, 252, 261, 262, 264, 382.
as to truth being in effectual virtue, 425.
as to elevation, 503.
as to sacrifice, 538, 545 550,, 551.
as to priesthood, 544.
as to adoration, 562.
as to unworthy reception, 658.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 677.
as to phrases, "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," 580.
as to sense of spiritually, 724.
Mosheim, Eccles. History, referred to, 422, 713, 714.
Motion, humbly presented to the consideration of Parliament, 377.
Musculus Wolfgang, quoted as to "giving and receiving," 738, 739.
Myconius, Oswald, quoted, 532.

Neal, History of Puritans, quoted, 37, 165, 175, 227, 238, 308, 310, 315, 328, 380, 631, 745.
referred to, 23, 183, 253, 292, 312, 569.
Neal, Rev. Dr., quoted, 478.
Nevin, Dr., quoted, 711.
quoted as to agreement between English and other Reformed Confessions, 407.

Nicholls, Dr., quoted as to words of delivery, 493.
Nicholls, Dr., Notes on Common Prayer, referred to, 292, 316, 482.
quoted as to Elevation, etc., 501, 502.
Nicholson, Bishop, quoted, 252, 253, 384.
as to phrases "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," 584.
Niemayer, Collectio Confessionum, 494, 495, 599, 600, 713, 717.
Nonconformist, the old, touching Common Prayer, 379.
Norris, Canon J. P., quoted, 731.
Nowell, see Catechism.

O'Brien, Bishop, referred to, 586, 588.
Œcolampadius, quoted, 393, 404, 695, 697, 729, 738, 742, 743.
Œpinus, referred to, 13.
Ollivant, Bishop, referred to, 297, 519.
quoted, 285, 286.
as to Overall's words, 299.
as to how we may be said to *give*, 336.
as to views of Cosin, 372.
as to adoration, 566.
as to sense of "take," 724.
Ordinal, 533.
of Sarum, 534.
Origen, quoted, 128.
referred to, 131.
Osiander, quoted, 541.
Overall, Bishop, the writer of additions to Catechism, 295.
his doctrinal views, 295—306, 407.
his letter to Grotius, 296.
Additional Notes (Nicholls') attributed to him in error, 296, 297.
his words quoted by Knox, 297.
MS. in which the words are found, 298, 299.
his Preface to Jewel's Works (1609), 302.
Whitgift's caution concerning him, 302.
his violation of Rubric, 303.
Owen, J., quoted, 256.
for language like that of our Catechism, 328, 329.
as to phrases "Real Presence," "Corporeal Presence," 582.

Palmer, Origines Liturgicæ, referred to, 491, 507.

Palmer, Origines Liturgicæ, quoted, 560.
Papers, Present Day, 524.
Parker, Archbishop, account of, 23.
quoted, 23, 34, 630, 636, 638, 639, 640, 646, 654, 656, 657, 691.
referred to, 178.
Parkhurst, Letter to J. Simler as to English rejecting Ubiquity, 167.
Parkhurst, Lexicon, quoted as to sense of *mystery*, 523.
Parry, Bishop, referred to, 354.
Parsons, quoted, 568.
Patrick, J., referred to, 678, 679, 680.
Patrick, Bishop, quoted, 254, 255, 286.
as to meaning of Catechism, 350.
as to relation to Christ's *Death*, 418.
as to Missal, 461.
as to oblation, 530, 531.
referred to, 519.
Pearson, Bishop, referred to, 536.
Perry, Rev. T. W., Declaration on Kneeling, quoted, 468.
referred to, 471, 576, 634, 671, 675.
Perry, Rev. G. G., History of the Church of England, referred to, 311, 481.
quoted, 380, 481.
Philpot, account of, 74.
as to limits of Christ's body, 74.
as to Church of Geneva, 75.
as to the plea of God's Omnipotence, 75.
as to Real Presence to receiver, 75, 76, 77.
as to Essential Presence, 76.
as to reception by wicked, 77, 705.
as to word "altar," 77, 78.
as to phrases "Essential Presence," "Real Presence," 579.
as to synonymous use of "eat" and "receive," 701.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 755.
Pilkington, account of, 146, 147.
quoted as to reception by faith, 147.
as to word "altar," 147.
Poinet, see Ponet.
Ponet, account of, 69.

Ponet, quoted as to the mouth of belief, 69.
as to Sacramental eating, 69, 70.
as to the eating of unbelievers, 70.
as to limits of Christ's Body, 70.
as to presence to faith, 71.
not the author of the Diallacticon, 72.
the probable author of Edward VI.'s Catechism, 182.
Potter, Archbishop, quoted as to Sacrifice, 551.
Powell, Vavasor, 379.
Poynet, see Ponet.
Prayer Book (Common), no Divine Service, by Vavasor Powell, 379.
Unmasked, 379.
Devotions, Episcopal delusions, 379.
Interleaved, 519.
Principles at Stake, 175, 461, 463, 477, 479.
quoted as to Consecration Prayer, 456, 559.
as to words of Delivery, 492.
as to elevation, 501.
as to rejection of the word "spiritually" in our Article xxx., 698.
as to Geste, 744, 745.
Procter, on Common Prayer, quoted as to the sanction of addition to Catechism, 294.
as to the doctrinal alteration in Edward VI.'s 2nd Book, 447.
referred to, 316, 514.
Prosper, Sentences of, 683.
Prynne—Short, Sober, Pacific Examination, 378.
Puller, Moderation of Church of England, quoted, 543.
Puritanism, English (Bradshaw), 380.
Pusey, Dr., quoted, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 101, 132, 261, 322, 474, 603, 616, 633, 734.
referred to, 224, 228, 242, 259, 268, 422, 471, 473, 487, 607.

Queres concerning the Book of Common Prayer, 378.

Rabanus Maurus, quoted, 126.
Rainolds (or Reynolds), Dr., referred to, 56, 308, 310, 461.
quoted, 529, 531, 543.

Randolph, Bishop, quoted, 183, 199.
Ratramn, see Bertram.
Redmayne, Dr., quoted as to reception by wicked, 627, 656.
Reformatio Legum, account of, 176—178.
how far a book of "Sanction," 178, 179.
quoted as to Ubiquity, 179, 180.
as to elevation, reservation, and adoration, 179.
as to reception by wicked, 180.
as to Presence in or under elements, 180.
as to Real Presence, 181.
as to sacrifice and priesthood, 181, 182.
as to elevation, reservation, and adoration, 502.
approved by Parker, 637.
Reformation Gleanings, see Gorham.
Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, 478.
Renaudot, quoted, 415.
as to breaking of bread, 492.
as to age of Liturgies, 543, 544.
as to simplicity of ancient Service, 553.
as to Invocation of Holy Spirit, 559, 560.
Repetitio Anhaltina, 713.
Resolution of case of Conscience, quoted, 572.
Reynolds, Dr., see Rainolds.
Reynolds, Bishop, quoted as to relation to Christ's Death, 418.
as to dynamical Presence, 427.
as to Presence in elements, 484.
as to phrases "Real Presence," "Corporal Presence," "Spiritual Presence," 584.
Review, Dublin, quoted as to agreement of Cranmer and the Catechism, 320.
as to consistency of Articles and Catechism, 366.
as to Black Rubric, 471.
as to adoration of Rome, 587.
Richardson, Lecture on Ritualism, referred to, 49.
Ridley, Gloucester, quoted, 499.
Ridley, referred to, 7.
account of, 45.
his influence of Cranmer, 45.

Ridley, quoted as to Corporal Presence, 46.
as to Sacramental "grace annexed," 46, 47; not "included," 47; promised and given not to the elements, but to worthy receivers, 47.
as to Presence by Spirit and Grace, 47, 48, 58.
as to the force of the words "Until He come," 48, 49.
as to figurative sense of the words, "This is my Body," 49, 50, 63.
as to Christ leaving His flesh, not in substance, but in mystery, and by grace, 56.
as to Christ's Body received by hearing the Gospel and by faith, 50.
as to Christ's Body being given as well in the word as also on the Cross, 51.
as to worshipping Christ in the Sacrament, 51, 55, 56, 58.
as to how Bread is called Christ's Body, 51, 52, 63.
as to the Blood being in the Chalice, 52.
as to what evil men eat, 53, 58.
as to the Lamb lying on the Table, 53, 54.
as to ambiguity of "really" present, 55; and "Real Presence," 57.
as to the limits of Christ's Body, 57.
as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 59.
as to "form of a Table," Lord's board, and altar, 59, 60, 61.
as to the Church of England, 62, 63.
perused Bradford's Sermons, 78.
explanation of his language, 97, 98.
as to agreement in England against Lutheranism, 164.
perused Catechism of Edward VI., 182.
as to phrase "Under the forms of bread and wine," 243, 244, 245.
as to elements being not bare signs, 270, 271.
as to Christ being Himself the given of the *res sacramenti*, 381.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 413, 414.
as to grace called flesh, 425.
as to phrases "Real Presence," 578; "Corporal Presence," 569.
as to *opus operatum*, 693.

Ridley, quoted, as to word "taken," 731.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 754, 755.
his estimation of Parker, 648.
his views of the Sacrifice, 497.
referred to, 148, 242, 443.
Rivet, quoted, 543.
Rivington, Rev. L., quoted, 392.
referred to, 567.
Robertson, Canon, "How shall we conform?" referred to, 292, 480, 519.
quoted, 558.
Rogers, account of, 148.
quoted as to reception by faith as by hands and mouth of soul, 149.
as to Synusiasts or Ubiquitaries, 149.
as to Corporal reception, 149.
as to reception by wicked, 149, 150.
as to mass and sacrifice, 150.
as to adoration, 150.
as to faith being as hand and mouth, 386.
as to reception by wicked, 623, 624.
as to agreement in England on the doctrine of the Eucharist, 644, 645.
as to Sacramental efficacy, 697.
referred to, 692.
Rupertus, quoted, 553.

Saddler, Rev. M. F., quoted, 508, 516, 520, 535, 632.
Salisbury, Bishop of, the late, 392.
Salmeron, referred to, 537.
Sancroft, Archbishop, quoted, as to the errors of the Church of Rome, 375.
referred to, 553.
Sancta Clara, quoted, 676.
Sanders, quoted, 568.
Sandys, account of, 150.
quoted, as to reception by wicked, 151.
as to Christ's Body being local, 151.
as to the Sacrament being a figure effectual, 151.
as to seeing, touching, digesting by faith, 151, 386.

Sandys, quoted, as to sense of words "This is My Body," 152.
as to seal and letters patent, 152.
as to effectual offer, 158.
as to reality of spiritual possession, 347.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 415.
as to effectual signs, 604.
as to sense of "spiritually," 723.
referred to, 635.
Saravia, quoted, 8, 660.
referred to, 660.
Sarpi, History of the Council of Trent, referred to, 12, 692.
quoted, 537.
Sarum Manual, 411, 502, 534, 590.
Scott, Bishop, 551.
Scudamore, Rev. W., "North Side," quoted, 483.
Search after cause of God's Wrath, 378.
Seckendorf, Historia Lutheranismi, quoted, 328, 707, 708, 733, 734.
Secker, Archbishop, on the Words of the Catechism, 344.
as to real and dynamical Presence, 428.
as to mystery, 524.
as to adoration, 572.
Service Book no better than a Mess of Pottage, 380.
Seymour, Rev. H., referred to, 479.
Sharp, Archbishop, as to reality of reception, 346.
as to Real Presence, 385, 428.
as to spiritual benefits, 424.
as to sacrifice, 520, 521, 529, 546.
as to 1st Book of Edward VI., 520.
as to adoration, 565, 587.
Sheldon, Bishop, quoted, as to phrase "Real Presence," 583.
Sherlock, quoted, 258.
Shipley, Rev. O., quoted, 453, 473, 502, 521, 589.
Sibbes, quoted, 286.
as to reality of spiritual *taking* and possession, 347, 353.
Sidonius, referred to, 529.
Smalkaldic Articles, 710.
Smectymnus, 377.
Smith, H., quoted for language like that on Catechism, 333.

Soames, Elizabethan History, referred to, 23, 165, 292, 308.
quoted, 309, 635.
History of Reformation, quoted, 446, 447, 498, 499.
referred to, 228, 513, 634.
Southey's Book of the Church, quoted, 363.
Sparks, Dr., converted from Nonconformity, 311.
Stillingfleet, referred to, 7, 223.
Stoffelius, 718.
Stowell, Canon, quoted, as to relation of Prayer Book to Missal, etc., 511.
Strype, quoted, 34, 160, 161, 162, 176, 177, 178, 199, 233, 506, 570, 637, 638, 640, 641, 642, 643, 655, 662, 667.
referred to, 165, 166, 167, 302, 634.
Stuart, "Thoughts on Low Masses," referred to, 9.
quoted, 10, 260, 452.
"Mediation of the Church," quoted, 10.
Suarez, referred to, 529.
Sumner, Rev. G. H., quoted, 745.
Survey of Book of Common Prayer, referred to, 316.
quoted, 376.
Swainson's Essay on Article 29, referred to, 657.
Swinnock, quoted, 154, 336, 387.
Syngramma Suevicum, 404, 714.
Syntagmia Theseum Theol. in Academia Salmuriensi disp. etc., quoted, 471, 528.

Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, quoted, 20, 100, 134, 137, 138, 247, 286, 287.
as to teaching of Catechism, 319, 320.
as to manducation by faith, 339, 360.
as to eating Christ's flesh as crucified, 360.
as to effectual signs, 604.
as to Liturgy, 475, 506, 508, 509, 512.
as to phrase "Real Presence," 560.
as to teaching of St. Augustine, 678.
referred to, 13, 20, 493.
quoted also, 477, 536, 608.
Taylor, Rev. S., referred to, 324, 744.
quoted, 722.
Tertullian, referred to, 123, 580.

Thirlwall, Bishop, Charges, referred to, 473, 479, 588.
quoted, 478, 524, 525, 542, 546, 548, 632.
Thorn, see Declaratio.
Thorndike, Herbert, quoted, as to the words "to us," 518.
as to sacrifice, 540.
his views, 699, 700.
Thorpe, William, quoted, 249.
Thoruniensis, see Declaratio.
Tillotson, Archbishop, quoted, as to Sacramental Conveyance, 410.
Toplady, quoted, as to relation of Prayer Book to Missal, etc., 511.
Torgau, Articles of, 719, 720.
Tracts for the Times, referred to, 467, 477.
Tracts for the Day, quoted, 7, 11, 101, 133, 137, 391.
referred to, 8, 20.
Traheron, Letter of, quoted, 162, 163.
Trevor, Canon, quoted, 136.
referred to, 266, 506, 519, 544.
Trial of the English Liturgy, 378.
Truths for the Times, 452.
Tyndale, account of, 41.
quoted, as to meaning of eating Christ's Flesh, 42, 43.
as to Christ's Body not present under the form of bread, 43; not so eaten, 44.
as to the sense in which the Eucharist is called by the doctors a Sacrifice, 44.
as to the word *Priest, Presbyter*, etc., 44, 45.
as to Lutherans and Papists, 81.
as to adoration, 134.
as to elements being not bare signs, 269.
as to real reception without the outward sign, 412, 413.
as to sacrifice, 537.
referred to, 227.

Ursinus, Z., quoted, 691.
as to Sacramental analogy, 388.
as to reception of substance and essence, 402.
as to Presence in Sacrament, 485, 486.
as to breaking of bread, 491.

Ursinus, Z., quoted, as to sense of *mystery*, 523.
as to phrases "Spiritual Presence," "Corporal Presence," etc.,582.
as to adoration, 587.
as to participation, 618.
as to "heavenly manner," 670, 725.
as to reception by unbelievers, 710, 711.
as to sense of "spiritually," 723.
as to reception of "Res Sacramenti," 726, 727.
as to "eating," 728.
as to Augsburg Confession, 733.
as to phrase "under the form," 733.
as to giving and receiving, 738.
as to force of "Institution," 740.
Ussher, Archbishop, quoted, 135, 136, 301.
as to reception of the "*Res Sacramenti*," 348.
as to conjunction altogether spiritual, 355.
as to spiritual hunger and eating, 358.
as to comparison with letters patent, 408.
as to reception of "that very thing" spoken of in John vi., 424.

Wagner, Rev. A. D., referred to, 9.
Wake, Archbishop, referred to, 223, 247, 328, 372, 429, 510, 524.
quoted, 409, 435, 466, 474, 504, 509, 567, 581.
Walcott, on English Ordinal, referred to, 539.
Walton, Isaac, Life of Sanderson, quoted, 558.
Warburton, Bishop, quoted, as to words of Institution, 740.
Ward, Dr., quoted, 691.
Waterland, quoted, 255, 256, 341, 354, 355, 382, 408, 419, 420, 429, 476, 518, 593, 608.
as to Prayer of Humble Access, 495.
as to Invocation of the Holy Spirit, 559.
as to Real Presence, 584, 585.
referred to, 372.
Westcott, "History of the English Bible," referred to, 227.
Westminster Assembly's Catechism, quoted, 330—332.
Westminster Assembly's Directory, quoted, 435, 490, 519. See Confession.

Wheatly on Common Prayer, referred to, 292.
quoted, 307.
as to North side, 482.
as to breaking of the Bread, 490, 491.
Whately, Archbishop, see Cautions for the Times.
Whitgift, Archbishop, Letter to Parker, 24.
account of, 29.
as to Real Presence, 29, 31, 32, 307.
as to Consubstantiation, 30.
as to the word "Priest," 30, 31.
as to the Church of England reformed, 33.
as to Overall, 302.
as to effectual signs, 603, 604.
as to adoration, 575.
Whittaker, referred to, 120, 523.
Wicelius, referred to, 529.
Wilberforce, Archdeacon, quoted, 453, 454.
Willet, account of, 153.
quoted, as to reception by wicked, 153.
as to reception by faith, 153.
as to sacrifice, 153.
as to expression, "Sub Sacramento."
as to elements being not bare signs, 278.
as to "exhibitive" signs, 301.
as to Prayer of Humble Access, 495.
as to *opus operatum*, 694.
referred to, 692.
Williams, Bishop, see Holy Table.
Womock, see "Beaten Oil."
Woodhead, quoted, 474.
Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, quoted, as to Bishop Overall and Fr. Mason, 303.
as to Rainolds, 311.
as to Cheney, 641, 642.
Wordsworth, Bishop, Greek Testament, quoted, as to meaning of "Mysteries," 522, 523.
as to word "taken," 731.
Wren, Bishop, 480.

York Manual, 411.
Young, quoted, 628.

Zaccharia, Bibliotheca Ritualis, quoted, 544.
referred to, 553.
Zanchius, H., quoted, as to faith being as hand and mouth, 387.
as to reception by wicked, 706.
as to testing question, 706.
as to Augsburg Confession, 737.
Zwingle, quoted, 301, 532, 729.
referred to, 491.
Zwinglians at Marpurg, 328.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Act of Uniformity, Queen Elizabeth, referred to, 39, 292, 293.
Charles II., referred to, 39.
Adoration, 9, 96, 109, 113, 118, 121, 130, 131—136, 150, 465—474, 502, 543, 561—566, 570—588.
Altar, 31, 32, 60, 61, 77, 78, 105, 106, 108, 109, 147, 451, 452, 526, 527.
Analogy, Sacramental, 338, 339, 340, 388—391.
Anglo-Louvain Calumniators, 28.
Articles of the Church of England, 391, 393, 394.

Baptism, 195.
Baptism by Women, 28.
Bell, Sacrying, 59.
Body of Christ. Limitations of, 57, 70, 73, 74, 137, 140, 151, 179, 180, 184, 185, 192, 193, 197, 198, 199, 200, 209, 213.
Infinite Merit of, 141.
Body, Sacramental efficacy pertaining to (as well as to soul), 90.
Bread, Breaking of, 490—492.
Breaking, see Bread.
Burleigh, Lord, 655, 656.

Canon 79, 191.
Canon 80, 294.
Canons of 1571, 233.
Canons of 1640, 526.
Cheney, Bishop, 664 sqq.
Church of England, False report of her doctrine and practice as to the Eucharist, 27, 28.
Concordia Witebergensis, 715.
Conference at Hampton Court, 56, 292, 308, 310, 311.

Conference at the Savoy, 291, 331.
Confession, Helvetic, 167.
Consecration, the Change resulting, 89.
Consecration Prayer, 456—459, 552—554.
Consubstantiation, 12, 141.
Conveyance, Deed of, 262, 263, 264, 356, 357, 408, 409, 410.
Council of Nice, 283.
Count Palatine, 91.
Crucifix in Queen Elizabeth's Chapel, 649, 650.

Death of Christ, Relation of Eucharist to it, 356, 415—420.
Declaration of Twenty-one Priests, 527.
Distinction between Christ's Body and the grace of the body, 83.
Dort, Synod of, 326.

Effectual, see Sacraments.
Elevation, 96, 502, 503.
Elizabeth, Queen, the Reformation in her reign, 38, 233, 567—570, 631, 649.
Episcopacy, Divine right of, 304.
Exhibitive, see Sacraments.
Exhortation in Communion Service, 434, 487.

Faith, the soul's mouth, 104, 126, 149, 151, 187, 195, 385, 386, 387.
the soul's hand, 129, 149, 151, 283, 385, 386, 387.
Faithful, meaning of, 363—370.
Faithful only receive the *res sacramenti*, 197.
Fathers, the ancient, their doctrine, 32.
Form of Bread and Wine (see Reception and Presence), 224 sqq., 231.

Geneva, Church of (Philpot), 75
Geste, Bishop, 664 sqq.
Giver, the, of the *res sacramenti*, a Divine Person, 381—385, 736.
Grace, in relation to Sacraments, 47 (Ridley).
received from God, not from Sacraments, 143.

Hampton Court Conference, 28.
Heaven, Faith must ascend thither to eat, 88, 111, 112, 123, 124.

Human Nature, see Nature.
Humble Access, Prayer of, 436.

Impanation, 133.
Institution, sense of the words of, 1, 116, 152, 212, 740 sqq.
Instruments, see Sacraments.
Invocation of Holy Spirit on elements, 559—561.

Kneeling at Communion, 572 sqq.

Language, Inconclusiveness of, untested, 154, 155.
of our Reformers and our Formularies, 170—173.
Lease, 410.
Letters Patent, 152, 408.
Lights on the Lord's Board, 59.
Liturgy, the English, opinions of, 589—591.
Lutheranism, 12, 35, 80, 91, 142.
in England, 159—167, 173.

Magdeburg Centuries, 654.
Manducation by faith, 24, 25, 69, 79, 104, 109, 117, 123, 126.
Oral, 17, 24, 66, 104, 110, 111, 126, 142.
Sacramental, 69.
Spiritual, 24, 25, 26, 65, 66, 67, 69, 88, 89, 109, 111.
Marpurg, Conference of, 328.
Mass, 60, 63, 65, 67, 68, 84, 85, 89, 95, 105, 114, 115, 117, 119, 147, 148, 150, 260, 283, 453, 526.
Massing Priests, 146.
Melchizedec, 119.
Mingle-Mangle, 146.
Missal, 461, 462.
Mysteries, 522—525.

Nature of Christ, Human (see Body), 139, 140, 349.

Objective Presence, see Presence.
Oblation, see Sacrifice.

Oblation, Prayer of, 545, 546.
Œcolampadius, 35, 36, 80.
Offer of grace in Sacraments, 158.
Omnipotence of God pleaded for error, 75, 138, 139, 140.
Opus Operatum, 692.
Ordinal, 533 sqq.
Oyster Table, 61.

Papists, 142.
Peucer, 712.
Poissy, Colloquy of, 328.
Presbyter, see Priest.
Presence, Corporal, 15, 18, 19, 46, 48 (Ridley), 81, 82, 85, 120, 121, 123, 131, 140, 214, 262, 371, 372, 578—586.
in or under the form of Bread and Wine, 43, 44, 48, 58, 63, 79, 84, 85, 92, 112, 113, 138, 141, 180, 211, 231, 236, 243, 250, 361, 371.
Dynamical, 72, 73, 88, 111, 112, 124, 141, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429.
Essential, 76.
Local and supra-local, 138, 151.
Organical, 54, 140, 371, 424.
Spiritual, 64 (Latimer), 75 (Philpot), 120.
by Spirit and grace, 47 (Ridley), 75 (Philpot).
to faith, 71, 79, 120, 185.
Substantial, 327, 342, 343, 348, 402, 403, 405, 407, 423.
Real, 5, 21, 31, 32, 48, 51, 52 (Ridley), 53 (Jewel), 57 (Ridley), 64 (Latimer), 75 (Philpot), 82, 83 (Bradford), 112, 123, 131, 143, 160, 180, 214, 243, 288, 371, 372, 374, 385, 428, 429, 578—586.
Real Objective, 5—11, 29—32.
of a Body, after the manner of Spirit, 13, 18, 19, 213.
Sacramental, *i.e.* not *real*, 97—101.
Priest, 44, 45, 95, 118, 119, 144, 145, 146, 182, 202, 217, 218, 283, 543—545.
Propitiatory, 105, 119, 121, 150.
Puritans, 308, 317, 370.

Real Presence, see Presence.

Reception "under the form of bread and wine," 224, 232, 288.
Spiritual, by faith, 86, 93, 109, 128, 129, 147, 149, 151, 153, 194, 195, 201, 202, 215.
by the wicked, without faith, 16, 24, 70, 77, 79, 83, 86, 91, 92, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 122, 127, 128, 129, 149, 150, 151, 153, 180, 202, 203, 209, 216.
its guilt, 158, 159, 160.
Refugees, English, 164.
Review, the last, of the Prayer Book, 555—559.
Rubric, as to covering with fair linen cloth, 56.
as to extremity of sickness, 411.
Black, 465 sqq., 576—586.

Sacraments, Grace annexed to, 46 (Ridley); not included, 47, 143.
moral instruments, 143.
effectual signs, 151, 193, 194, 603, 689 sqq.
exhibitive signs, 321.
not bare signs, 268—280.
Sacramental, sense of, 97—100, 232, 243, 753 sqq.
Sacrifice in Eucharist, 9, 31, 32, 44, 45, 59, 68, 69, 84, 89, 95, 105, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 121, 122, 130, 144, 145, 147, 148, 150, 153, 181, 182, 197, 217, 282, 285, 372, 451, 529—532, 535—542, 548—551.
Seals, illustrating Sacramental efficacy, 87, 152, 160, 193, 251, 252, 262, 263, 281, 408, 409, 410.
Side, North, 479—484.
Signs, effectual—see Sacraments.
Substance of Christ's flesh not mixed with ours, 137, 141.
Sun, used to illustrate Spiritual Presence, 59 (Ridley), 72, 73, 124, 184, 193, 255.
Sunusiasts, 149.
Synod of Dort, see Dort.

Traditions, 146.
Transubstantiation, 12, 29, 80, 82, 83, 84, 121, 141.
Trent, Council of, 32.

Ubiquitaries, 149, 161.

Ubiquity, 112, 166, 167, 214.
Union, Sacramental, 208.

Vestments, controversy concerning, 38, 167, 631, 632.

Will with conveyance (Wake), 409.
Worship, sense of, 56.
of the Sacrament, 51, 55, 56.

Zwingle's Views, 34, 35, 36, 80.

DATE DUE

JUN 30 2002

JUN 30 2003

OCT 19 2004

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01030 9781